

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 966

24

TE 499 906

AUTHOR Taylor, William R.
 TITLE American History Laboratory Project. Final Report.
 INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Madison.
 Spons Agency Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
 Bureau No ER-6-2988
 Pub Date Nov 68
 Grant OEG-37-062988-2034
 Note 90p.
 Available from ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of English, 508 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Ill. 61820 (on loan only)

EDRS Price EDRS Price MF-\$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors *College Programs, Colonial History (United States), Experimental Groups, *History Instruction, Instructional Materials, Laboratory Procedures, Laboratory Training, Puritans, *Research Methodology, Research Skills, *Small Group Instruction, Teaching Methods, *United States History

Identifiers Fourierist Phalanx (Wisconsin), Salem Witch Trials

Abstract

The results of an experimental project in American history which introduced to students the methods of historical investigation in specific historical areas through small group research rather than through the college survey course are described in this report. Discussed are (1) the course organization, consisting of two semester units in which small groups examined primary and secondary source materials on the Salem witch trials and the Fourierist Phalanx at Ceresco, Wisconsin, in the 1840's; (2) the philosophy and methods of "doing" history; (3) the successes and drawbacks of teaching this new course in small groups; and (4) student participation in and evaluation of course work. Appendices, composing three-fourths of the document, include transcripts of a staff meeting; a class log of a field trip and a typical discussion; examples of several student papers; an evaluation-questionnaire for students; syllabi for the units of Salem witchcraft and the Wisconsin Phalanx; research assignments for the study of Salem; a chronology of Ceresco events; and a bibliography of published and microfilmed sources on Ceresco. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (JB)

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT

Contract No. OEG-37-062988-2034

Grant No. 144-7310

BRG-2983

PA-24

OE/BR

ED033966

AMERICAN HISTORY LABORATORY PROJECT

William R. Taylor
State University of New York
at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, New York

November 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TE499906

Table of Contents

iii	Summary
iv	Staff
1	Introduction
5	Methods
7	Findings
7	1. Course Organization
8	2. The Historical Exercise
8	3. Problem of Transferring Newly Acquired Skills
9	4. The "Small Group" Class
13	5. Teaching the New Course
15	6. Student Participation in Planning
16	7. Student Evaluation
18	Conclusion
20	Appendix I
22	Appendix II
24	Appendix III
52	Appendix IV
56	Appendix V
62	Appendix VI
73	Appendix VII
76	Appendix VIII
83	Appendix IX

SUMMARY

The Wisconsin Laboratory Project is a continuing experiment undertaken by a group of college teachers of American history with the object of devising an alternative to the introductory survey course. A pilot project was carried out at Smith College in the summer of 1966. This project was supported by a grant from the Office of Education. The course here reported on was developed at the University of Wisconsin during the academic year 1966-67. The course was further developed during 1967-68 and is being given again this year, both at Wisconsin and at the State University of New York. Those giving the course continue to look upon it as an experiment in need of continuous reexamination and development.

The course was offered in a slight modification of the lecture course-quizz section format with smaller sections of about ten and less frequent and more selective use of lectures. Each section met twice a week under a member of the staff. The coordination of section work was provided through a staff seminar that met every week.

The most important findings had to do with organizing students for group investigation of an historical problem. Our objective in such organization was to provide students with a more realistic idea of how history is written, how historical questions are developed and pursued, how, in other words, history is "done." It was our assumption that individual guidance with research projects of the kind provided by honors or tutorial programs was not a practicable solution for most institutions of higher learning. The objective was therefore to devise methods for stimulating and guiding the historical inquiries of small groups of students.

The staff of the course has developed units of source materials designed to provoke serious historical questioning by undergraduate students. These units are made up entirely of unstructured primary sources that relate to developments of manageable size, like the Salem witch trials. Students are introduced to these units through a sequence of historical exercises of scaled difficulty and complexity. These exercises, perhaps the most significant achievement of the staff, successfully introduced students to many of the skills required in analyzing evidence and organizing it for presentation.

The course was received enthusiastically by students and staff alike. It needs further work to concentrate on the more complicated final stages of historical investigation. Some staff, quite rightly, have criticized the course for failing to provide some experience in viewing change over long periods of time.

STAFF

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS

Merle Curti
Eric Lampard
William R. Taylor

INSTRUCTORS

Neil Coughlan (now Wesleyan University)
Donald M. Scott (now University of Chicago)

TEACHING ASSISTANTS

David Allmendinger (now Reed College)
Stephen Nissenbaum (now University of Mass.)

INTRODUCTION

This experiment was made possible through two grants from the Office of Education: one for a pilot project at Smith College in the summer of 1966 and a second to help meet the added cost of giving a pilot course to ninety students at Wisconsin last year. The direction our experiment was to take was set up by a Conference jointly sponsored by the Office of Science and Technology and the Office of Education at Tufts University that Eric Lampard and I attended in the September of 1965. The conference was concerned with the question of innovation in higher education. Since those who initiated it were teaching in the natural sciences, the discussion tended to focus on the feasibility of "laboratory" instruction in other areas of undergraduate education. The historians who attended drew up a tentative proposal for a "laboratory" course in history. At that Conference we worked very closely with Eric McKittrick of Columbia and Stanley Elkins of Smith, as we did during the summer pilot project. During the summer we were also joined by David Rothman of Columbia and, occasionally, by Stanley Katz.

The direction which our experiment took was determined by certain assumptions we made concerning the study of history. Ordinarily, in a history course, the lectures move chronologically from one period to another, from one aspect of a society to another; while the students in quiz section move from one substantive block of reading, which may or may not be discussed in lectures, to another substantive assignment, which falls due two weeks later. The result is that a certain amount of movement, a certain amount of what appears to be progress, is built into the way such courses proceed. As we considered the American survey course a number of deficiencies became apparent. These deficiencies in many ways resemble those of the literary survey, which has largely disappeared from the college curriculum. Such courses normally involve a "synthesis" by lecture and by textbook of the area and period to be studied, in this case the United States from 1776 to the present. The student, in effect, is taken on a conducted tour of a succession of Presidential administrations and quaintly named epochs. Not only does he visit the "age"

of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson and perhaps Roosevelt, but "eras" of reform, good feeling, progressivism, expansionism, sectionalism, big business and normalcy, and there are "revolts" of the common man, the farmer and the industrial laborer. A string of slogans attempt to do a student's conceptualizing for him: "retreats," "breakthroughs," "aftermaths," "critical" periods and periods of "transition." As in all conducted tours he is made to stay with the group and take his cues from the briefing provided by the guides. Should his interest be aroused by a particular event, it is difficult to make provision for him to develop such an interest. Within the objectives of such a course, moreover, the development of such an interest is largely irrelevant. Since the object is to provide an overview, qualitative emphasis is almost impossible to attain.

It was this briefing function of the conventional survey course that we came in our planning to question, at least as an introduction to historical study. We left open the possibility that such a briefing might prove useful at some later point when students had developed some skills with which to defend themselves from lecturer and textbook.

Other disciplines give other kinds of introductory courses in which one has quite a different sense of moving from point to point; courses, for example, in the social sciences--economics, sociology or psychology--which introduce students to a methodology and attempt to teach them how to apply it. In these courses the student is exposed to a number of concepts in an experimental context, and, over a period of time, he becomes acquainted with a discipline and familiar with its methods and their use. These are usually the explicit objects of such a course; but we were forced to conclude that they could not be the objects of an introductory history course.

For history is in a real sense something of an anomaly among academic disciplines. It is a social science since it makes use at times, of techniques employed by the social sciences; but it is also a humanistic study, very much involved with individual insight and perception and with the uncharted course of human responses to a body of data of some kind. Partially for this reason we concluded that it would be necessary to learn more about the practice of history before we could devise an alternative to the survey. We are better acquainted with the shortcomings of the survey than with what, if anything, should replace it. Many Universities, for example, have dropped the survey only to replace

it with more "advanced" and specialized courses. What is it, we asked ourselves, that we want students to "know" when they come to us in the areas of our expertise? And, what is it that we want them to be able to do? We assumed, in groping toward a new kind of course, that our task was not to "reform" existing kinds of survey courses but to suggest more radical departures--to provide one or more different options for beginning the study of history. We were, in other words, attempting to be really experimental--and we are under no illusions about having found a solution at all, or even most, of the problems we have raised about existing ways of studying history. We are satisfied that we have made a start, and it is on this initial achievement that I want to report to you today.

In introducing students to history, we began to feel, it might be appropriate to introduce them to the kinds of things, insofar as we could determine them, an historian does. If history is a subject worthy of serious study, it ought to be studied operationally and not simply for the attitudes it is capable of generating. We felt that the process of discovering the historical relevance and irrelevance of data ought to be taken into account and actively experienced. If history is in any sense a science, then the student ought to be put in a position where he can look upon authoritative historical generalizations skeptically and critically. If history is among other things, a way of thinking about society, a way of conceiving of social change, and not a body of knowledge about a period or geographical area that has to be "covered," then how does one go about inducting undergraduates into such a way of thinking?

As we considered this problem we more and more concluded that much of what a historian does depends on the kinds of serious, reflective activities that go under the name of reading--a surprisingly complicated process, at least for historians, when one begins to examine it. The complexity of the act of reading is, I suspect, what underlies the paradoxical fact that the historian's work is at once much simpler and more complicated methodologically than that of other social scientists. This means that there is no clear set of methods that belong to history in the sense that a certain set of methods can be said to belong to the other social sciences. There are no methods, that is, which are exclusively or unfailingly historical. And, furthermore, since history is eclectic in its methods, and since the particular document or a particular problem

may vary, the historian has to be prepared to find the methodological approach of sociology or economics, for example, to be inapplicable. The problem is, then, how to approach something where the procedures seem to be so plastic and so fluid, and seems to require that something different be done from one moment to another. Since methods are not "out there," and cannot be hauled before us and displayed, learned and applied, the student's resources, we concluded, would have to be developed internally, as he studies himself experiencing many different kinds of historical material.

It was our assumption too, that if students can become more aware of what they do when they investigate and work with evidence, they will become more critical and more astute readers of other people's history books and less passive listeners to other people's lectures. But the real basis of this course was the belief that there is a cumulative process in the exercise and class discussions, in which students gain experience in developing their own procedures, and in learning to work more resourcefully and independently with the historical materials they confront. We assumed, then, that students once they had been given this kind of instruction would work more critically, with a more lively, alert consciousness of what is involved in investigation, analysis, reading, writing--the "doing"--of history.

METHODS

The Smith summer experience taught us, we think, that anything resembling "natural" historical curiosity ought not to be expected of any group of students. Moreover, the problems that arise when students are encouraged to undertake individual investigations appeared to be unmanageable for faculty and students alike in the context of a regular academic semester. The most useful discovery of the summer concerned the intellectual excitement that can be generated when a small group of students investigates sources bearing on a limited and concrete historical problem.¹ The course that we planned for the fall was designed to take advantage of this discovery. We accepted some ninety students, more or less at random, from those that applied to us. We made no effort to advertize the course, no special notice was given of its appearance, except for a separate entry in the announcement of classes for the fall. This brief notice simply stated that an experimental introductory course was to be offered, that enrollment was limited to ninety and that consent of the instructor was necessary. The prerequisites for admissions were 1) sophomore standing and 2) no previous college work in American History. The group of students that we accepted had a statistical profile very similar to that of a comparable sample in the regular survey course.² No effort was made to recruit potential history majors or students with good records. We deliberately decided to "overstaff" the course during the first year in order to obtain the high degree of exposure to individual student response that we thought necessary for evaluating the effectiveness of what we proposed to try. For this purpose, we requested that the Office of Education pay for two full-time instructors and we asked the University of Wisconsin to more than double the number of teaching assistants that would ordinarily be assigned to a course of this size. In doing so we felt that we would all feel free to spend more time with our students both in individual conference and in formal "laboratory conferences" in the library.

1. See Appendix i.

2. This statistical study was made by a consultant from the School of Education, and was reported on to us but never reached us in written form.

During the fall term the course met irregularly once a week in lecture, when the need for a lecture was felt to exist. For the other two meetings of the course, the students were divided into small groups of eight to ten. The three regular members of the Wisconsin department and three teaching assistants each met one of the groups twice a week. Two full-time instructors met with two groups a week. Roughly one paper every two weeks was expected of each student in the course. These papers varied in length from two to ten pages and frequently provided the basis for one of the discussions.

The materials for the first half of the semester were concerned with Salem at the time of the witch-trials. We first introduced the students to an anthology of documents bearing on the witchcraft episode.³ We then gradually introduced them to virtually all the printed sources--transcripts of the hearings, the observations and judgments of contemporaries and documents bearing on the Salem community. Since many of these printed documents are in short supply they were microfilmed and duplicated for student use. During the second half of the semester we confronted the students with all of the sources available on the Fourierist Phalanx at Ceresco, south of Ripon, Wisconsin during the 1840's.⁴ During most of the second semester we were fortunate in having at our disposal the complete archives for the University Settlement Society on the Lower East Side of New York City from the period of its founding through about 1929. As in the use of the Ceresco records, multiple copies of the Settlement materials were placed on microfilm and selective portions of them were mimeographed for classroom use. These sources, unlike those pertaining to Salem, were almost exclusively in manuscript.

In stead of turning the students loose on these materials, as we tended to do in the summer, we tried to move them into a familiarity with the variety of each body of sources through successive and more-or-less graduated stages. Our emphasis was upon the operations that historians can perform to "make sense" out of data of this kind. Each of the papers or exercises that we assigned

3. Appendix ii.

4. Appendix iii.

was designed to acquaint students with a particular operational problem.⁵ Some of these problems concerned the reading and analysis of sources while other pertained to problems of writing about sources. During the course of the year we groped our way toward a number of conclusions about the problems involved in giving this kind of course. Most of these conclusions, furthermore, have been confirmed by the experience of giving the course with the same materials a second year. Since we were able to take on about twenty new students in the second semester of the first year, moreover, we were able to correct some of our early miscalculations almost at once.

FINDINGS

1. Course Organization

We had begun on the assumption that an historical inquiry, once a group of students were launched upon it, would be self-generating, although none of us knew precisely what this meant. I think we were still assuming, that students, either singly or in groups, would become fascinated with an historical problem and dog it down to a solution. I believe that we were overly impressed with the "lock-step" feature of the survey course as its principal objection to students. Increasingly, we came to recognize that a laboratory course, if it is to create more than student despair and chaos in the library, must be much more carefully organized and administered than most history courses. One of the problems that continues to perplex us is posed by the simultaneous need to organize the work of the students in advance and to retain the necessary flexibility of an on-going experiment. The preparation of materials and the working out of written assignments must clearly be done considerably in advance of the classes where they are used, but at the same time the use of a particular assignment presupposes results from earlier assignments that can only be conjectured at the time such an assignment is made. It was the prominence of this problem that has led us to place increasing importance in a weekly staff meeting at which the results obtained in the different classes can be compared and the readings and assignments prepared and adjusted accordingly.⁶ This year the materials available on each topic have been catalogued and each student has been provided with an annotated bibliography with call numbers and reel numbers appended. Increasingly, too, we came to recognize the importance of having sources

5. Appendix iv.

6. Appendix v.

available to us in class. Toward the end of the year we made greater and greater use of mimeographed transcriptions that could be consulted, argued over and written about during class time. The consistent discipline of an available text seemed to retrain the Big Talkers and the Loose Talkers who otherwise dominate discussion classes. Some of our best classes are commenced by confronting students with a source unfamiliar to them and asking them to write about it or comment on it for fifteen or twenty minutes.

2. The Historical Exercise

It was our assumption from the beginning that the writing we asked students to do should not be of the traditional kind--precis-ing and paraphrasing sources. From work that I had done in an upper level course on intellectual history I had arrived at a kind of exercise that virtually forced students to treat sources rhetorically, i.e. as events, as happenings and not as static expression to be summarized. During the year we felt our way toward a similar kind of exercise that seemed to us suitable to this course. We were helped toward this conclusion by experience that Stanley Katz had had with a freshman seminar at Harvard. We increasingly decided that the basis for an exercise was a kind of "translation". Students were asked, for example, to devise a biography of one of the accused at Salem, solely from trial testimony. They were asked to make charts and tables out of narrative and they were asked to write bits of analytic narrative based on lists and tables in the Ceresco materials, i.e. the Sexton's record of arrivals, births and deaths and the stock record of the sale and purchase of shares.⁷ In each instance we found it increasingly valuable to ask students to examine precisely how they got from what they read to what they wrote, to the judgments and concepts which they brought to the materials. We became much more sensitive to the uses and abuses of sources in historians such as Marion Starkey who wrote from the same materials.

3. Problem of Transferring Newly Acquired Skills to Different Contexts

More slowly, I think, we have come to recognize the need to confront students more than once with a similar operational problem. A single exposure to the problem

7. Appendix vi.

may succeed in making a theoretical point, but if the student is expected to apply and reapply what he has learned in other contexts, he must be put through something like old-fashioned "drill." In our attempts, for example, to introduce students to use of personal correspondence, we gave an assignment that required them to trace the different tactics employed by one of the Headworkers of University Settlement in writing to different correspondents. They were asked in effect to distinguish the various roles assumed by the writer. They were then asked to indicate what they were able to learn about the Settlement from the variety of roles assumed. While the papers were unsatisfactory, practically all of the students had discovered the importance of this kind of analysis by the end of the class in which the assignment was discussed. Nonetheless, a second assignment of a similar kind a week later showed only barely perceptible improvement. A third assignment, however, brought decidedly better results.

4. The "Small Group" Class

We were leery from the outset about the precise nature of the small group meetings. We were sure that the graduate seminar, even at its best, was not a model for what we wanted to do. It was precisely this kind of isolated, lonely researches and inquiry into a subject of interest to no one else that seemed to have inhibited our students during the Smith summer. We were equally clear about wanting to avoid a kind of informal bull session that rambled from topic to topic. Toward the end of the year when we were working on the University Settlement we succeeded in making, I think, very good use of small group discussions as a means of acquainting students with the problems of interpreting the different kinds of materials available to them--Council minutes, head worker reports, Settlement publications and personal documents such as letters and autobiographical writings. Increasingly, we succeeded in doing this in advance of student exercises on the same kind of source. When we did this, the results were markedly better. The most successful procedure we discovered was that of having students read and write in class for a few minutes about a source they had not seen before, i.e. reducing account of Council. Those of us who taught did the same brief writing assignment ourselves in class. This procedure had the advantage of providing a certain immediacy in the confrontation with the source. It made discussions real laboratory sessions. It also permitted us in staff meeting to compare our experiences with these small groups much more exactly, and to single out important problems to be met with future assignments.

The first year's experience with the course has permitted us to refine the conclusions we reached last summer after the pilot concerning the ways in which the "small group" can investigate a common problem like the Salem witch trials, or the founding of a Utopian community like the Seresco community in Wisconsin. I think the value of group investigation is not an issue. For the introduction of large numbers of students to American History, this general method has certain specific merits, most of which we suggested last summer. Beginning students need not work in isolation on traditional term-papers; the group itself assumes the function in teaching; the teacher's role becomes something other than that of tutor. Furthermore, individuals can pursue their own work--with the advantage of having an audience for that work--and a tutorial relationship between student and teacher is not ruled out.

The simple gathering of students into groups and launching them on investigations of a common problem has not produced magical results, nor is it the only conceivable method of introducing them to the study of history. It may have a special pertinence, however. It assumes our teaching will be done with fairly large numbers of students. It permits us to study on a large scale the problems which students encounter in beginning historical investigations; these problems may have less to do with individual personalities than with ways of thinking and working common to all students. It permits us to talk to one another and begin to isolate general needs which students have and devise techniques we can employ to meet them; if these needs and techniques can be communicated to others in our position, then our method may seem all the more pertinent. Finally, it is not a traditional approach about which we know a good deal already. While the group in itself has not been magical, we are beginning only now to understand the ways in which groups function best. It is in this area, at least, that my own experience in the fall semester seems to apply.

Discussions appear to have taken three fairly distinct forms. The accounts in one teacher's log indicate that these forms usually did not blend together in any one discussion; rather, each discussion tended to take one of the distinct forms. The differences in these discussions seem to have been related less to the preparation or mood of students than to the kind of work we set out to do at the beginning.

The first of these forms appeared in September, at

the start of the semester, when we discussed the individual essays on social change. It appeared again in our discussions of exercises on Salem and Ceresco, whenever the work for the day involved discussion of a piece of writing by an individual in class.*"My role as teacher in these discussions was quite familiar to me. They were easy to prepare, involving careful reading and analysis of their writing. I looked especially for characteristic language difficulties, use of evidence, and the precise statement each student seemed to be making. In the social change essays, for example, I led the group to see that each of them had written about a change of attitude, and we speculated on why they had written about attitude.

"This same kind of discussion occurred whenever we discussed individual exercises. There were moments of interest for each student as his own work came before my scrutiny, but as a means to get students to criticize their own work. I think these sessions must be regarded as not very effective. It may be that students ought to read one another's work closely, and develop critical skills in this way, but the place to begin is not the group discussion. This kind of work seems suited to the traditional methods of criticizing student writing through written criticism and in tutorial sessions. Even when such work is done in discussion, it becomes a tutorial, with everyone but the teacher and one student left out.

"Toward the end of the semester, my group and several others began to hear oral reports by individual students on small bits of research on Ceresco. The form these discussions took was quite similar to the first one, focusing on one person's work. If the student had finished his research, we criticized it; if he were still planning his work, we had a brainstorming sessions.

"My role in these discussions was less familiar to me, though I had some comparable experiences at Smith last summer. Gradually, I grew quite comfortable in the form. My task involved a lot of close and anxious listening, and then a kind of hectoring which must have become quite predictable. If the student came in with vague, sweeping generalizations about society and humanity, as did David Reitman in his report on Ceresco, I would ask for evidence. If he came in with endless bits of disconnected information, as did Tom Brew, I would ask for a statement or hypothesis. ("How does all of this strike you? What can you say about it?") This kind of hectoring could be applied to any report.

-11-

* The following account is that of one of the teaching staff,
David F. Allmendinger.

"While it may have prevented me from detecting problems more subtle than a student's inability to find evidence or to connect particular items of information, this form had the beauty of releasing me from the obligation to look at all the information on Ceresco along with my students. I did not have to research along with them, and direct each investigation at every point, as I had last summer. The students used these sessions to inform one another on Ceresco, which marked an improvement over our discussions of written exercises. (My group did not pursue a common hypothesis; I thought that this would have involved an arbitrary choice of investigation, and would discourage individual work.)

"A clue to the difficulty with this form lies in the questions I found myself asking students. These questions assumed that students are unable either to find concrete evidence, or to explain the particular information they have seen. This may be an accurate assumption, but this kind of discussion does not help the student at the point he needs help: when he confronts a piece of evidence and attempts to explain it. This discussion occurs in one room, his confrontation with evidence in another.

"The third form of discussion I noticed in my group involved our working with materials, almost as if we were in a laboratory. We tried this on two occasions during our work on Salem. The first time we worked for an hour on identifying and grouping the people who appeared in the five trials; the second time was our discussion of Starkey. We tried it twice again on Ceresco, in our discussion of the constitution and when we considered the Ceresco materials as if we were archivists. These were the four discussions which I found most satisfying.

"My role in these discussions seemed most familiar, since it was modeled on my teaching for History 621. I could prepare a discussion and felt on each occasion that I had something to teach which students would need. In the identification-classification discussion on Salem, for example, my aim was not to ask the students to note the age or occupation of participants in the trial, but merely to discover as many ways as possible to identify and group people. For this discussion, Susan and I spent an entire weekend doing the exercise along with them. I think we would no longer have to do this, whatever the group of people my students were examining, for the lesson

was not that the afflicted at Salem were predominantly young girls with fairly closely defined family connections; the lesson was that there are meaningful ways to identify and group the people in a town. I did not have to repeat this extensive preparation when we came to the sexton's records of Ceresco.

"Our discussions of Starkey and the Ceresco Constitution involved more familiar techniques of using texts, in this case a secondary source and a legal document. Our archival discussion in some ways resembled the identification-classification work; I merely asked the group to determine in what ways it is meaningful to describe documents and distinguish between them.

"I have no hard evidence on what my students thought of these four discussions. Their reaction reminded me of the cemetery excursion at Chesterfield last summer, which was successful in these terms. They had a common piece of material in front of them; their task was to learn how to work with it. Their helplessness, their boredom in working along with the Ceresco materials suggests that this is what students need most. It is also something we can teach them, perhaps in groups the size of conventional quiz sections."

5 Teaching the New Course

One of the more ironic developments for those of us who taught the course was our growing uncertainty as to what "teaching" history involved. All of us had engaged extensively in lecturing and most of us were relatively complacent about our ability to conduct student discussions. Yet we discovered when we examined the need for a lecture or when we assessed the effectiveness of those we gave that lecturing had a very limited place in this kind of course. It was a useful means of describing the variety of sources available on a certain topic. It was also useful for providing a chronology of events before students were asked to wade into the morass of discrete documentation. Occasionally we found it useful to discuss an important body of controlling assumptions that was only implicit in the sources, such as the state of legal knowledge and practice in the late seventeenth century and the theories of Fourier and their American adaptation in the early nineteenth. Once or twice I used the occasion of a lecture as an attempt to describe for the students where the experiment was going, but I am convinced that these particular lectures were much more useful to me than to those who heard them.⁸

It was in the small group discussions that we encountered our most perplexing teaching problems. It was very difficult for those of us who had taught a long time and to whom students deferred, to work with them as one among equals. It was the younger and less experienced teachers who initially seemed to have obtained the greatest success in working with students under these conditions. They were less apt to "take over" discussions, and perhaps because of their own uncertainties and puzzlement, less apt to introduce explanatory concepts and hypotheses. Before the end of the year all of us have learned something about this exacting kind of teaching. The most useful guide to the kind of skill and sensitivity required in this teaching was provided us in an assessment of the Smith Project written by Walter Metzger of Columbia, and I simply quote an excerpt describing his own experience in two of these seminars:

"Observing two seminar leaders in action, I was struck by the care--almost the delicacy--with which they avoided authoritative imposition. They did not ask answer-indicating questions--questions that make the students guess at the expectations in the asker's mind. They did not reformulate the answers in such a way as to heighten and enlarge--and thus distort--them. They did not put their erudition on display; they did not lecture. What they did do was to elicit information and hopes--to have the students summarize current knowledge and anticipate future steps. I call this gentle conversational leadership the pedagogy of restraint, and I think it has an important place in any beginning course in history that substitutes inquiry for instruction. The point is that, whether we want it to be so or not, students learning history by investigation do engage, albeit with weaker resources, in the same activities as their masters. Too abruptly confronted with their inadequacies, too quickly reproved for their innocences, too often patronized by a veteran's generosity, students can despair of doing anything more than playing at a game not intended for them. Restraint gives confidence a chance to grow and eases the tension of comparison."

The problems that our students encountered in the course of the year were obscured, at least initially, by their enormous enthusiasm for this kind of undertaking--by the very fact of participation in an experiment and by the controlling role they were led to believe they had in contriving a new kind of history course. The class contact between themselves and the professor who taught them was singular, if not unique, in the experience of almost all of them. Thus, we had from the beginning a "Hawthorne effect" to reckon with."

Nonetheless, it became increasingly evident that they were feeling frustrations and discontent of several different kinds.¹⁰ Some of the difficulty was inevitable and ought to be expected whenever this kind of teaching is done. Other problems are being eliminated during the second year. Students, for example, who are accustomed to thinking of history as a succession of events, chronologically presented, where each event is in some sense a consequence of its predecessor, were quite naturally fretful about their lack of what they called "background" for each of the topics they confronted. They felt that a knowledge of Puritanism was essential to understanding Salem just as they believed that knowing about the Utopian Movement as a whole was essential to understanding Ceresco. The idea of establishing a beach-head in historical sources and expanding it into an insight concerning a particular period proved difficult to grasp, as I think it will always be. It was their initial assumption that background was required to understand the sources and not vice-versa. Another problem lay in our rather arbitrary selection of the unit materials.

6 Student Participation in Planning

Very little was said after September about the rationale for the selection of the three topics, too little it now seems apparent. Nor did the students feel they had a very important part in helping to plan this phase of the course, an assumption in which they were quite correct. The larger significance of Ceresco or the University Settlement remained obscure to them and they found many of the materials they were forced to read either oblique or dull or both. This year, as an experiment, two student volunteers from each small group have been asked to work with two of the instructors in developing a unit for the spring semester which is based on the large Civil Rights collection in the Wisconsin Historical Society--the Daisy Bates papers pertaining to the Little Rock crisis of 1957. While the results of this experiment are not known at this time, the response of students to the subject and the task of selection has been very enthusiastic. For the long-term success of this kind of course it seems perfectly clear that the selection of materials is not an arbitrary question, and that topics and units of materials ought to be rotated to maintain the instructor's freshness of point of view and that students in such a course must be made to feel that they have some part, however small, in planning, perhaps through helping to develop inquiry units based on local archives.

10. Appendix ix

7. Student Evaluation

Each student was asked to write a formulative evaluative essay at the end of both semesters. In addition to this all students enrolled in the course in the spring semester were asked to complete a questionnaire prepared by one of our evaluators in the School of Education. Copies of these materials are to be found in Appendix x. In addition to these more formal instruments of assessment, all of us were in almost daily contact with the students in our seminars and an effort was made to coordinate the student responses we were receiving in our weekly staff meetings. This kind of "running commentary" on the course proved to be of greater value than the static assessments at the close of the semester. We found, for example, that the morale of the course appeared to go through a definable cycle with each body of materials,-- initial enthusiasm, bewilderment, anger and paralysis, a growing sense of control and understanding and final boredom or tedium. The staff went through a somewhat similar cycle. Each time we reached the stage of tedium it seemed appropriate to move on to new materials. What follows is an attempt to summarize student response and, at least in part, to account for it.

Almost everyone initially felt zest in taking part in an "experiment." But some confessed a sense of great bewilderment. For the first time they realized that the study of history involved more than note-taking on lectures, set assignments of specific reading, hour examinations, more, in short, than being exposed to the acquisition of historical information in organized form presented presumably a received body of reliable knowledge. By the last week of the semester the initial sense of bewilderment had disappeared. It was, however, not without much effort that the group came to terms with the interrelatedness of historical study as inquiry and historical study in the sense of receiving substantive information and knowledge. Though the class discussions and conferences indicated that there had been at times a flagging zest, I believe that the group, in varying measure, approached a comprehension of the major aims of our experiment and felt that the total educational experience had been a valuable one and for several, if we are to believe their testimony, more valuable than any previous "exposure" to the study of history. I regret that I am unable to spell out this growing awareness and intellectual development in each student as fully as I might be able to do had I put more emphasis on the log or journal keeping and had I read these reports regularly and discussed them individually with each student.

To report thus on the sense of general achievement on the part of the students is not to suggest that the members of the group have been without criticism of our procedures. The end-

of-semester evaluative papers are marked by a refreshing candor. Before summarizing these criticisms I should say that I am convinced that even the "weakest" of my students has surprised and pleased me in what she has demonstrated in her later papers that she has learned. The motivation remained on the whole consistently high. There has been a notable lack of expressed concern about "grades"--considerable evidence suggests that in varying degrees each has become more fully and explicitly aware of the over-importance that has previously been attached to "grades." I also note on the part of each student a growing skill in expression, orally and in writing, and an impressive improvement in the mechanical and "literary" competence in expression. The number of weighted adjectives and adverbs has, for one thing, notably decreased. Also rewarding to me and I believe to the students is the evidence of a growing capacity to work together, to share bibliographical information, insights and suggestions. I believe I am justified in also reporting that among the other values the group appreciates has been the experience of working closely with an instructor, of having from the instructor detailed marginal comments and queries as well as an over-all critique of each paper, of being regarded as "important" and an active participant in the process of learning in general and of exploring the nature of historical learning in particular.

To round off these general comments before turning to details let us summarize the criticisms the students have made of the course in general and of the procedures of our group in particular.

1. Several feel that they would have learned more about the nature and problems of historical study had they been permitted to encouraged to take a larger part in the planning or selection of topics to be investigated and in the ways of investigating them.

2. There is an almost unanimous expressed feeling that the few general lectures on technical problems were useful; that it would have been helpful to have listened to the tapes of Taylor and Lampard talks midway in the semester and at the end of it, after their final papers had been submitted.

3. Everyone in the group also believes that a few lectures providing a substantive context for the specific documents or problems would have made their inquiries more meaningful.

4. Several also expressed the opinion that the exercises on withcraft material would have been more meaningful had we explained more fully and explicitly the purposes of these exercises, that the sense of bewilderment would have been less, the motivation for the work, greater. No one recognized what might have been "lost" had we done so.

5. The group felt that much had been learned by my initial insistence on the importance of clearly defining the meaning and uses of such term as "fact," "community" and "social change" and

appreciated my subsequent insistence on the clarification of the meaning of such terms as "associationism." But several expressed the wish that more had been done explicitly, either through substantive lectures or specially designed exercises, with the concepts of "community" and "social change" over the time span and in the particular decades in which our inquiries fell.

6. Three or four students felt that their experiences would have been broadened and deepened had there been more communication with the proceedings and experiences of members of other groups.

7. Everyone agreed that our emphasis on the importance of being explicitly aware of and self-conscious about the operations and procedures was immensely valuable but would have been even more valuable had these emphases been communicated more fully and explicitly in the first assignments and activities. Here, it seems to me, the students have failed to sense the importance of the fact that they themselves learned something about the importance of all this through their own trials and errors and their own assessments of these.

8. Although there has been appreciation of the experience of learning how to work together some have felt that this would have been more rewarding had I put more emphasis than I did on the importance of each student challenging the statements of "fact," insights and generalizations on the part of their colleagues. That this feeling exists is one of my failures. I can only say that in previous courses the students had not learned to do this whether for lack of opportunity or from mere habit, and that it took some time for the members of the group to feel at ease with each other and with me.

CONCLUSION

Our three semesters of experience with the laboratory course have convinced us that there is a need for this kind of Introductory course we have begun to develop. Indeed, we now believe that such a course has a function distinctive from that of the period-area surveys, and we are thinking of entitling it, "An Introduction to the Study of History" rather than "An Introduction to the Study of American History," in order to keep it from being held up to standards of inclusiveness--that is, whether it gives an adequate representation of American events. It strikes us that there are a number of indices of its effectiveness quite apart from the enthusiasm of both students and staff. We have been able to trace the developing skill of a substantial number of students in handling original source materials. This kind of course also has the effect of deflating the Big Talkers and Glib Writers who tend to dominate and excel in conventional history courses. Each semester students in the course have produced surprising, even brilliant, pieces of analytic or narrative writing that reveals an ingenuity in the use of original sources.

worthy of our best graduate students. It seems clear, furthermore, that this kind of experience attunes students to the shortcomings of secondary sources and makes them in general very critical readers of historical works. It has also produced a disproportionate number of history majors, who are, incidentally, very discontented with the so-called advanced courses they are now taking.

Appendix I

Extract from American History Laboratory Project, Final Report, submitted January, 1967, pps. 7-8.

Though after a while the students had projects they professed to be interested in, Allmendinger, one of the instructors, decided to take the group to the Chesterfield cemetery in order to see what would happen when a group was thrust into the midst of cold historical artifact. The class went to the Chesterfield cemetery having been told to do three things: 1) To write everything they could about the cemetery: 2) Then and only then to ask a series of questions about the cemetery: 3) Then and only then to suggest what other kinds of sources and questions they might be led to from a study of one cemetery. The students began by looking at each stone. Bonvillion took charge quickly and told the other students that they would have to stop and ask questions and to do this with some method. When they couldn't decide, Bonvillion declared a 15 minute think period, then a conference on questions and divisions of labor. They conferred and argued about what constituted a viable question to pursue.

"What constitutes a generation? Can you trace them?"

"Can you trace family histories?"

"Should we record every stone?" (they decided not to, because 'the evidence will always be there')

"Should description be complete?"

"Can you tell about death per decade in the town? What would that suggest?"

"Study customs in names? Epitaph customs?"

"Study effects of wars? Epidemics?"

"Who dies first, men or their wives? men or women?"

"Life spans of parents vs. children."

"Occupational information deduced from stones."

"Social hierarchy from stones. Kinds of stones--their wearing, introduction, etc."

"Study terms of address (Mr., Esq., Deacon). Who were town's first families? enduring families?"

"Number of years per generation--changes? differences in families? Oddities of burial customs? (Some families together with outsiders)

"Child deaths."

"Size of family plots. Does this indicate anything about emigration from the town? or simply a shift to another cemetery?"

"Family intermarriages can be traced."

"Maiden names of women--when were they first recorded? When were there most spinsters?"

"Nationality of names--when the non-English begin if ever."

"Epitaphs and carvings by era."

"Who would be likely to be buried in a family plot, versus the town plot? Did burial in the town cemetery signify social standing?"

After raising these and other questions of a similar nature, each of the students went about a task. Bonvillion worked on war veterans and their ages; Pietrowski worked on names and ages at death; Jacopian and Trott worked on families, tracing them for generations, as did Ware. Allmendinger worked on spinsters and maiden names. Bonvillian considered this the most exciting thing done so far. Jacopian disagreed. After 2 1/2 hours in the cemetery, the group went to the Chesterfield historical society, which contained mainly old artifacts. But the students also got interested in the town genealogy and Bonvillion found the records of the Methodist church.

Several days after this experience in the Chesterfield cemetery Bonvillion and Ware undertook to study the Northampton Association, a Fourierist community that existed just outside Northampton for several years in the 1840's. They sought to enlist the aid of other members of the group in this inquiry, but were turned down principally because Trott, Jacopian and Pietrowski did not at this point appear to want to abandon the various 'projects' upon which they were now embarked, even though none had been very successful with his project. Bonvillion and Ware proceeded in the same manner as they had in Chesterfield, asking and pursuing similar questions. This task was pursued with great energy by Bonvillion and Ware for the rest of the summer, a pursuit which included bumming a ride to Yale with two of the instructors so that they could go through the MacDonald manuscripts.

Appendix II

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN Department of History

HISTORY 290

Mr. Katz

Unit I: Salem Witchcraft

READINGS:

Required Books:

For immediate purchase: David Levin (ed.), What Happened in Salem? (Harcourt-Brace paperback)

For future purchase: Marion Starkey, The Devil in Massachusetts: A Modern Inquiry into the Salem Witch Trials (Dolphin paperback)

Books on Microfilm (Reading Room, State Historical Society):

W. Elliott Woodward, Records of Salem Witchcraft, Copied from the Original Documents. 2 vols., Roxbury, Mass., 1864 (1 Reel, call number F844SW/R31)

Samuel G. Drake, The Witchcraft Delusion in New England. 3 vols., Roxbury, Mass., 1866 (1 Reel, call number F844 SW/D76)

Samuel P. Fowler, Salem Witchcraft, Boston, 1865 (1 Reel, call number F844SW/F78)

Woodward's Records contains a more inclusive account of the legal account of the legal proceedings excerpted in Levin, pp. 3-80. A mimeographed index of this book will be distributed shortly. A table of contents to the various trials can be found in the beginning of the book.

Drake's Witchcraft Delusion and Fowler's Salem Witchcraft contain identical materials, and they can be consulted interchangeably. Both contain the following two works:

Cotton Mather, Wonders of the Invisible World (1692)

Robert Calef, More Wonders of the Invisible World (1698)

In Drake, the Mather book comprises volume I, and the Calef book comprises volumes II-III. (Note that Mather begins only after 98 pages of introductory material written by the editor.)

In Fowler, Calef comes first; Mather begins on page 375.

The required books and the books available on microfilm will form the basic reading for the first unit of the course. In additions, a number of books will be available on reserve in the State Historical Society and in Room 43, Memorial Library. A somewhat larger bibliography can be found in Levin, pp. 237-238.

Books on Reserve (Reading Room, Historical Society):

Samuel G. Drake, Annals of Witchcraft in New England, Boston, 1869 (Largely material on witchcraft cases before 1692)

Charles W. Upham, Salem Witchcraft, 2 vols., Boston, 1867 (Largely material on Salem Village)

[Samuel Willard], Some Miscellany Observations On our Present Debates Respecting Witchcrafts, in a Dialogue Between S. & B. Boston, 1869 (Originally published in 1692, this was written by a Boston minister) -22-

Books on Reserve (Room 43, Memorial Library):

George L. Burr, Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases (A miscellany of narrative material)

Perry Miller, The New England Mind: From Colony to Province, Boston, 1953 (Chapter XIII, "The Judgement of the Witches," is a modern interpretation)

SCHEDULE:

The course will meet for two continuous hours each week in sections. These section meetings should be held on Wednesday and Thursday. In addition, the course will meet as a body for fifty-minute lectures at the officially scheduled 11 A.M. hour on certain Mondays. The weeks during which these Monday meetings have been planned are listed in the following schedule. (No meetings have been planned for Wednesday at 11 A.M.)

Week of Sept. 18

Monday: Lecture on the chronology of the witchcraft proceedings

Sections: Discussion of mimeographed sheet handed out on Monday

Assignments (for following week):

1. Read Levin, What Happened in Salem?, pp. 3-80.
2. First paper: Brief biography of a witch (The details of this and other papers will be forthcoming)

Week of Sept. 25 (No lecture)

Sections: Discussion of first paper

Assignments (for following week):

1. Read Levin, pp. 83-106.
2. Read Woodward, Records of Salem Witchcraft, all material relevant to the witch selected for the first paper.
3. Second paper: An expanded biography of the witch.

Week of Oct. 2

Monday: Lecture on Puritanism and/or other technical subjects

Sections: Discussion of second paper

Assignment (for following week): Read Mather, Wonders of the Invisible World (available in both Drake and Fowler editions)

Week of Oct. 9 (no lecture)

Sections: Discussion of Mather

Assignments (for following week):

1. Read Levin, pp. 106-135.
2. Read selections (to be assigned) from Calef, More Wonders of the Invisible World (available in both Drake and Fowler editions)
3. Third paper: the opposition

Week of Oct. 16

Monday: Lecture on Salem Village

Sections: Discuss third paper

Assignments (for following week):

1. Read Marion Starkey, The Devil in Massachusetts.
2. Read Perry Miller, The New England Mind: From Colony to Province, pp. 191-208 (Chapter XIII, "The Judgement of the Witches")
3. Fourth paper (due in two weeks): The trial of the witch you have selected in the first and second papers (N.B. This paper is due the week of Oct. 30)

Week of Oct. 23 (No lecture)

Sections: Discuss Starkey and Miller

Assignment: (Continue working on the fourth paper)

Week of Oct. 30 (No lecture)

Sections: Discuss fourth paper

MECHANICS:

The course offices are located in Rooms 104 and 108 at 228 North Charter Street. Office hours for the instructors will be announced shortly.

Papers: Submit two copies of each paper--an original and a carbon or Xerox. All papers should be delivered to your instructor's mailbox (next to the History Department Office in Bascom Hall). Papers are due by 5 P.M. two days before the sections when they are to be discussed. (i.e. Wednesday sections due 5 P.M. Monday; Thursday sections due 5 P.M. Tuesday)

Appendix III

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
Department of History
November 8, 1964

History 290

Mr. Katz

Unit II: Ceresco (The Wisconsin Phalanx)

READINGS:

Book for purchase: John Humphrey Noyes, History of American Socialisms (Dover pb)

Works on microfilm: (Microform Reading Room, State Historical Society)

See "Ceresco Microfilms: A Calendar" (stencil, 10 pages) and "Ceresco: Bibliography of Published Sources" (stencil, 12 pages).

In addition, a one-page summary of the 13 reels of microfilm has been distributed under the heading "Ceresco Microfilms." When requesting a reel of microfilm, ask for it by reel number and short title. (E.g. "Reel 2, Typescript Secretary's Records," or "Reel 8, Harbinger")

SCHEDULE:

Seminar meetings for this unit will ordinarily be divided into two parts. The first part will consist of a discussion of the work done since the previous week, and the second part will consist of an examination of mimeographed hand-outs representative of the readings assigned for the following week.

Written work will probably be assigned each week. Ordinarily, though, this work will consist of relatively informal "progress reports" rather than formal papers. There will probably be two more formal papers, the first due December 5-6 and the second due January 18 (the first day of exam period). There will be no final exam.

This schedule, unlike the schedule for the Salem unit, does not provide a complete list of assignments. It is intended to indicate the kinds of topics we will be dealing with each week, and the sources from which specific assignments will be drawn. The assignments themselves will be handed out each week.

Only two lectures have been definitely scheduled (on November 13th and 27th). More may be planned as needed.

Week of November 6

Assignments (for following week):

1. Warren Chase, The Life-Line of the Lone One, pp. 1-130 (Reel 13)
2. Selections from Albert Brisbane, Concise Exposition of the Doctrine of Association (stencil to be handed out in section)
3. Progress report

Week of November 13

Monday: Lecture on chronology and materials (NOTE: This lecture will be given in the auditorium of the State Historical Society.)

Sections:

1. Discussion of Chase and Brisbane
2. Discussion of hand-outs on the formation of the community

Assignment: (for week after Thanksgiving)

1. Diary of Michael Frank (Reel 4)
2. Southport Telegraph (Reel 13)
3. Wisconsin Argus (Reel 12)
4. Progress report

Week of November 20

Monday: Coffee hour to be held in Union. Because of Thanksgiving, there will be no sections this week.

Week of November 27

Monday: Lecture on Fourierism, etc.

Sections:

1. Discussion of the formation of the community
2. Discussion of hand-outs on institutional life

Assignments (for following week):

1. John Humphrey Noyes, History of American Socialisms, pp. 411-448
2. Secretary's Record (Reel 1 or 2)
3. Paper

Week of December 4

Sections:

1. Discussion of papers and of institutional records
2. Discussion of hand-outs on domestic and financial life

Assignments (for following week):

1. Personal letters and recollections (Reel 4)
2. Stock books and ledgers (Reel 3)
3. Progress report

Week of December 11

Sections:

1. Discussion of domestic and financial records
2. Discussion of hand-outs on Fourierism

Assignments (for week of January 3):

1. The Phalanx (Reel 6)
2. The Harbinger (Reel 7-9)
3. Brisbane, Concise Exposition (Reel 2)
4. Progress report

CHRISTMAS VACATION

Week of January 3

Sections:

1. Discussion of Fourierism and intellectual records
 2. Discussion of hand-outs on the break-up of the community
- 75-

Assignments (for following week):

1. Secretary's Record (Reel 1 or 2)
2. Final financial records (Reel 3)
3. Miscellaneous materials from the Pedrick collection (Reel 4)
4. Record of Births, deaths, and removals (Reel 3)
5. Chase, Life-Line of the Lone One (Reel 13)
6. Progress report

Week of January 8

Sections:

1. Discussion of the break-up

Assignment:

1. Final paper due Thursday, January 18 (first day of exam period)

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
Department of History

History 290

Mr. Katz

Ceresco: a Chronology

- 1835 Settlement of Southport (now Kenosha), Wisconsin, by a group of families from upstate New York.
- 1843 Nov. 21. Fourierism first debated at Franklin Lyceum, Southport.
Dec. 22. By-Laws of Southport Fourier Club adopted.
- 1844 Mar. 6. Constitution of Wisconsin Phalanx reported by committee.
Mar. 23. Officers elected at meeting of members (first meeting recorded in Record Book.)
May 8. Committee's choice of domain approved by members.
May 27. Beginning of community life.
June 15. Last recorded meeting in Southport.
Sept. 2. First meeting of stockholders on domain.
Dec. 2. First annual report at stockholders' meeting.
- 1845 Feb. 6. Act of Incorporation.
Feb. 14-18. Resolutions transferring assets to incorporated Phalanx.
Apr. 7. First meeting of stockholders of corporation.
Apr. 24, 29. New By-Laws adopted.
Aug. 7. Resignation of L. M. Parsons as president accepted.
- 1846 July 30. L. M. Parsons expelled.
Oct. 31. Organization of Ceresco Union reported in Harbinger.
- 1848 Feb. 21. New By-Laws, etc., adopted.
Dec. 9. New By-Laws adopted.
- 1849 May 29-30. By-Laws concerning board repealed, and boarding-house ordered rented.
June 5-6. First survey for village of Ceresco.
Aug. 20. Meeting called to discuss dissolution.
Aug. 28. Dissolution voted.
Sept. 24. Bids invited for rent of public buildings.
Oct. 29. Miscellaneous property ordered sold at auction.
Dec. 13. All By-Laws repealed.
- 1850 Jan. 29. Act of incorporation amended to permit dissolution.
April 5, 18. Final plat for village of Ceresco surveyed and recorded, respectively.
April 22. Sale of Phalanx real estate began.
May 9, 14. First deeds executed and recorded, respectively.
Dec. 9. Last stockholders' meeting and election of officers.
- 1852 Dec. 6. Final division of assets.

- 1855 Aug. 24. Ceresco Union attacked by Ripon Spur for its advocacy
 of Free Love.
- 1856 April. Last reference to Ceresco Union.
- 1857 July 18. Last meeting of Council of Wisconsin Phalanx.

The official name of the community was the Wisconsin Phalanx. The Fourierites called the township in which they settled Ceresco after Ceres, the Roman goddess of the growing vegetation, and the region is often spoken of today as the Ceresco Valley. The village of Ripon, adjoining the earlier Ceresco settlement, has since expanded, however, so as to include most of the Phalanx lands within its city limits, and Ripon has replaced Ceresco as the name of the township.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
Department of History

History 290

Mr. Katz

Ceresco

Bibliography of Published Sources

I. Primary Sources

Most though by no means all of these sources are contained on the Ceresco microfilms. Each item has been assigned a number, beginning with #101. Since nineteenth century periodicals depended largely on each other for their material, many of these items were printed in two or more places. In such cases, that location is listed first which is available on the Ceresco microfilms, and it is followed by alternative locations.

In addition, some of the items were reprinted in such later compilations as John Humphrey Hoyer's History of American Socialisms (#182) or S.M. Pedrick's essay on Ceresco in the Proceedings of the Wisconsin Historical Society (#186), both of which are available on reserve in the Historical Society reading room.

A number of these sources are not contained in either the Ceresco microfilms or in Hoyer or Pedrick. Most of these (e.g. the New York Tribune) can be found in the Historical Society through normal channels: -- check the card catalogue.

There are, however, a few sources that are not available in Madison. These are included in the bibliography for purposes of completeness.

A. PRINTED REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS--OFFICIAL

101. Phalanx, p. 70 (Feb. 5, 1844): "Meeting of the Friends of Association. At Southport, Wisconsin Territory," by S. Fish, president, and C. Clement, secretary.
Includes text of Preamble and Resolutions, adopted Dec. 11, 1843, providing for a Fourier Club.
102. By-Laws of the Southport Fourier Club, adopted Dec. 22, 1843; in Phalanx, pp. 70-71 (Feb. 5, 1844).
The article also describes the election of officers that day, the report being signed by T. Newell, president, and Lester Rounds, [recording] secretary.

103. Constitution and By-Laws of the Wisconsin Phalanx (1844). (No copies extant.)
500 copies of the Constitution and By-Laws were ordered printed on Mar. 25, 1844 (Record Book, 1:13), the day the latter were adopted; and there were subsequent references to the publication (ibid., 1:16; Apr. 12).
104. "An Act to Incorporate the Wisconsin Phalanx," approved Feb. 6, 1845; Wisconsin Territory Laws, (1845) pp. 70-75.
Copied in Record Book; then published by Phalanx (#105, #106); and later reprinted in History of Fond du Lac County (1880; #183), pp. 402-403.
105. Wisconsin Phalanx. Officers... Act of Incorporation... By-Laws (Southport (?), 1845), broadside in one continuous column. [MacDonald MSS., pp. 206-207; Pedrick Transcripts, Miscellaneous, pp. 173-174 (an original printed copy, marked "From Wm. Starr Papers")].
Contains by-laws as adopted by Council, Apr. 24, 1845, and by members Apr. 29. A terminus ante quem would seem to be established by the listing as president of L. M. Parsons, whose resignation was accepted Aug. 7, 1845 (Record Book, 1:73). No resolution to print occurs, however, in the records until Feb. 2, 1846 (ibid., 1:108).
106. "Annual Statement of the Condition and Progress of the Wisconsin Phalanx, for the fiscal year ending December 1, 1845," signed by W. Chase, president; Harbinger, 2:47-48 (Dec. 27, 1845).
Printed originally in the Southport Telegraph, summarized from there in the Southport Herald, and reprinted from the latter by the N.Y. Tribune, Jan. 17, 1846. The publication in the Southport Telegraph was official, and the Phalanx bought 150 copies (Record Book, 1:95; Dec. 1, 1845).
Reprinted in part by Noyes, pp. 418-421; in History of Fond du Lac County (#183), p. 404; and by Pedrick (#186), pp. 207-208.
107. "Annual Statement of the Condition and Progress of the Wisconsin Phalanx, for the fiscal year ending Dec. 7, 1846", signed by W. Chase, pres.; Harbinger, 4:79-80 (Jan. 9, 1847).
Also printed in Fond du Lac Journal, Dec. 31, 1846; Pedrick Manuscripts, Miscellaneous, pp. 3-5; Reprinted in part by Noyes, pp. 422-425; in History of Fond du Lac County, p. 405; and by Pedrick (#186) pp. 211-212.
108. "Statement of the Condition of the Wisconsin Phalanx, at the Annual Settlement, for the Fiscal Year, ending Dec. 6, 1847," signed by Benj. Wright, pres.; Harbinger, 6:100-101 (Jan. 29, 1848).
Reprinted in History of Fond du Lac County (#183), p. 406; and in part by Noyes, pp. 434-435; cited by Pedrick (#186), p. 215.

109. Wisconsin Phalanx. Act of Incorporation... By-Laws... Rules and Conditions of Admission to Resident Membership... Covenant ([Southport (?), 1848]), broadside in two wide columns; Pedrick Transcripts, Miscellaneous, pp. 175-176 (an original printed copy).
Contains by-laws, etc., as adopted Feb. 21, 1848, and that day ordered to be printed.
110. "Statement of the Condition of the Wisconsin Phalanx at the annual settlement for the Fiscal Year ending December 4th, A.D. 1848," signed by Stephen Bates, president (dated Dec. 13, 1848); The Univercoelum and Spiritual Philosopher (N.Y.), 3:103 (Jan. 13, 1849). Also printed in Harbinger, 8:117-118 (Feb. 10, 1849). Reprinted in part by Noyes, pp. 439-440; and cited by Pedrick (#186), p. 216.
111. "Address to the Friends of Reform and Association," signed by W. Chase, chairman; Stephen Bates, sec. (dated at Ceresco, Nov. 13, 1849); Spirit of the Age (N.Y.), 1:362-365 (Dec. 8, 1849). Reprinted in Commons, Documentary History of American Industrial Society (#190), 7:263-273.
112. "An Act to amend an act entitled 'an act to incorporate the Wisconsin Phalanx,'" approved Jan. 29, 1850; Wisconsin, Laws, 1850, p. 23; chap. 34. Reprinted in History of Fond du Lac County (#183), p. 407.

B. PUBLISHED ACCOUNTS BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS

113. Phalanx, p. 189 (June 29, 1844): "Wisconsin Phalanx," by Geo. H. Stebbins (dated at Domain of the Wisconsin Phalanx, May 27, 1844). Reprinted from Southport Telegraph, (to the editor of which it is addressed). Reprinted by Noyes, pp. 412-414.
114. Phalanx, pp. 280-281 (Oct. 7, 1844): letter from Warren Chase (dated at Ceresco, Sept. 12). Reprinted in part by Noyes, pp. 414-415.
115. New-York Weekly Tribune, May 10, 1845, p. 6: "Wisconsin Phalanx," by L.M. Parsons, pres, (dated at Ceresco, Apr. 15).
116. Harbinger, 1:160 (Aug. 16, 1845): "Wisconsin Phalanx." Supposedly from Tribune, though the article has not been located there. Reprinted in Ripon Commonwealth, Feb. 15, 1907. Extract from letter of member denying a report of failure that had been published in Green Bay Republican.
117. Harbinger, 1:207-208 (Sept. 6, 1845): "Correspondence," by W. Chase (dated Aug. 13). Reprinted in N.Y. Weekly Tribune, Sept. 20, 1845, p. 4; reprinted in part by Noyes, pp. 416-418.

118. Harbinger, 2:46 (Dec. 27, 1845): "Progress at the West."
Reprinted from N.Y. Weekly Tribune, Dec. 20, 1845, p. 6:
"Associative Movements," by J.S. (dated Nov. 13).
119. Lapham, I.A., Wisconsin: Its Geography and Topography, History, Geology, and Mineralogy (2nd ed.; Milwaukee, I.A. Hopkins; N.Y., Paine & Burgess, and Saxton & Miles; St. Louis, Nafis, Cornish & Co., 1846), pp. 157-158.
Quotes recently published letter from Warren Chase; Pedrick transcripts, Misc., p. 157.
120. Harbinger, 2:300-301 (Apr. 18, 1846): "Wisconsin Phalanx," by W. Chase (dated Mr. 3).
Reprinted in part by Noyes, pp. 421-422.
121. Young America! (N.Y.), 3(16):4 (July 11, 1846) "Association With Combination," by W. Chase (dated May 27).
Reprinted from Boston Investigator.
122. Harbinger, 3:33 (June 27, 1846): "Correspondence" (dated May 27).
Describes second anniversary of arrival at domain, celebrated "to day".
123. N.Y. Daily Tribune, June 13, 1846, p. 1: "Wisconsin Phalanx -- Celebration" (dated May 28).
Also printed in N.Y. Weekly Tribune, June 20, 1846, p. 4.
Reprinted in Ripon Commonwealth, Dec. 1, 1905; and later, May 29, 1914.
124. Harbinger, 4:258-259 (Apr. 3, 1847): "Model Phalanx in the West," by W. Chase (dated Feb. 8).
Cited by Noyes, p. 425, with an error in the date, however.
Reprinted, with comment by S.M. Pedrick, in Ripon Commonwealth, Sept. 30, Oct. 7, 1938. States 18 reasons why American Associationists should choose the Wisconsin Phalanx as their projected Model Phalanx.
125. The Regenerator, a Free Paper, ed. by Orson S. Murray (Fruit Hills, Ohio), (n.s.), 2:9 (1847): letter from O.H. Capron (dated Mar. 1, 1847).
Transcribed in Macdonald MSS., pp. 203-204. No copy of this issue of this periodical has been located.
126. Harbinger, 5:130-131 (Aug. 7, 1847): communication from the Ceresco Union of Associationists (dated June 27).
Reply to circular from the Women of the Boston Union of Associationists.
127. Harbinger, 5:151 (Aug. 14, 1847): "Wisconsin Phalanx," by W. Chase (dated June 28).
Reprinted from Wisconsin [Southport] Telegraph. Also printed in N.Y. Weekly Tribune, Aug 4, 1847, p. 2. Reprinted in part by Noyes, pp. 425-426. The salutation in the Tribune version is "Friend Sholes"; in the Harbinger, curiously, "Friend Cheever."

128. Harbinger, 5:232 (Sept. 18, 1847): "Correspondence," by W. Chase (dated Aug. 21).
Reprinted by Noyes, pp. 431-434.
129. Harbinger, 5:294-295 (Oct. 16, 1847): "Reform and Reformers," by W. Chase (dated Sept. 5).
Reprinted from the [Boston] Investigator. Discusses relationship between various reform movements (National Reformers, Abolitionists, Peace Societies, Associationists, and Socialists), but says nothing specifically about the Wisconsin Phalanx.
130. Harbinger, 6:7 (Nov. 6, 1847).
Extract from letter from secretary of Ceresco Union.
131. Harbinger, 6:77 (Jan. 8, 1848): "Domain of the Wisconsin Phalanx," by W. Chase (dated Dec. 7, 1847).
Reprinted in part by Noyes, pp. 430-431. Reply to Cooke's description (#151).
132. Harbinger, 6:100-101 (Jan. 29, 1848): "Letter from Wisconsin," by W. Starr (dated Jan. 1).
Letter transmitting annual statement (#108), and other information.
133. Boston Investigator, An Infidel Paper, May 10, 1848. "Correspondence--Wisconsin Phalanx."
Includes letter from Uriel Farmin, secretary of Wisconsin Phalanx, dated Apr. 1, addressed to John Ferral, Pittsburgh, Pa. The latter, under date of 4th Mo. 23d, 1848, transmits Farmin's letter.
134. Boston Investigator, June 28, 1848, p. 1: "Wisconsin Phalanx," by W. Chase (dated May 27).
Describes anniversary celebration and complains of lack of interest on part of Harbinger.
135. Harbinger, 7:83 (July 15, 1848): "Wisconsin Phalanx."
Reprinted from N.Y. Daily Tribune, July 7, 1848, p. 1; and later by Noyes, pp. 436-438. Extract from letter by D. S., a member of the Wisconsin Phalanx, who had previously participated in the communities of Sylvania, Leraysville, and Skaneateles.
136. Harbinger, 7:125 (Aug. 18, 1848): "The Wisconsin Phalanx and Infidelity," by U[riel] F[armin].
Reprinted in part by Noyes, pp. 435-436; and by Pedrick in Proceedings (#186), pp. 218-219.
137. Harbinger, 7:140 (Sept. 2, 1848): "Wisconsin Phalanx."
Reprinted by Noyes, pp. 438-439. Extract from a letter by a member to Van Amringe.

138. Univercoelum and Spiritual Philosopher, 2:313-314, 341; 3:43, 59, 156 (Oct. 14, 28, Dec. 16, 23, 1848; Feb. 3, 1849): "To the Friends of Association," by W. Chase.
The second installment is entitled "Industrial Association," and is dated at Ceresco, Oct. 4, 1848; the last three installments are headed "To the Friends of Organization" and are dated respectively Oct. 1848; Nov. 16, 1848; Jan. 6, 1849; the final one coming from Madison, Wis.
139. Harbinger, 8:117-118 (Feb. 10, 1849): "Statement of the Condition of the Wisconsin Phalanx," by S. Bates (dated Jan. 16, 1849).
Transmits annual statement (#110), and other information.
140. N.Y. Daily Tribune, June 18, 1849, Supplement, p. 2: "Wisconsin Phalanx." Reprinted in Univercoelum and Spiritual Philosopher, 4:70 (June 30, 1849). Includes statement by Warren Chase.
141. Spirit of the Age (N.Y.) 1:260-261 (Oct. 27, 1849): "To the Friends of Social Reform," by W. Chase (dated Oct. 1).
Reprinted in part in Commons, Documentary History (#190), 7:282-284.
142. N.Y. Daily Tribune, Mar. 30, 1855, p. 7: "Associationists."
Report of meeting in New York City, at which Warren Chase made comments on Wisconsin Phalanx.
143. Social Revolutionist, 1:103-104 (April 1856): "The Ceresco Union," by M.E. Morse.
Announces that former members at Ceresco still hope to build a Unitary Edifice.
144. [Chase, Warren], The Life-Line of the Lone One; or, Autobiography of the World's Child (Boston: Bela Marsh, 1857), pp. 112-130.
The indicated pages deal with the Wisconsin Phalanx and Warren Chase's part in it.
145. Circular (Oneida Community), (n.s.), 2:16 (March 27, 1865): "Note to the Circular," by Warren Chase (dated at Vineland, N.J., March 15).
Describes Male and Female Industrial College he was then seeking to establish. The Circular published other writings by Warren Chase, some reprinted from the latter's Spiritualist paper, the Banner of Light, Boston (see Circular, [n.s.], 1:353, Jan. 23, 1865; 2:333, Jan. 1, 1866). The Wisconsin Phalanx was not discussed in these articles, however.
146. Stone's Free Press, Ripon, June 4, 1885: "An Old Pioneer."
Interview with Warren Chase, then 72 years old, who was visiting Ripon for the first time in 23 years.

147. Milwaukee Sentinel, Jan. 31, 1904: "Story of the Phalanx recalled by Chester Adkins' Death. Mrs. Hunter of Ripon, One of the Members, Tells of Manner in Which Famous Community Was Conducted, and of the Causes Which Led to the Breaking Up of the Organization," by Mrs. Ada C. Merrell (dated Ripon, Jan. 30).
Reprinted in Ripon Commonwealth, Oct. 21, 1904: "Reminiscences of Early Days. An Interesting Talk with Mrs. Hunter, who came to Ripon in 1844." [Clippings of both in Pedrick Transcripts, Miscellaneous, pp. 152-153 and 154-155].

148. Rounds, Horace E., "Free Love Ended Ceresco Colony. Son of Wisconsin 'Fourierite' Tells Recollections of Noted Experiment. Saw Original Phalanx House. Anniversary of Settlement of Village Was Occasion for Merry Making and Special Refreshments," Milwaukee Evening Wisconsin, article with date line of Harper, Wash., June 15 [1910].
[Clipping in Pedrick Transcripts, Miscellaneous, pp. 161-162.]

C. PUBLISHED DESCRIPTIONS BY VISITORS AND OTHER EYE-WITNESSES

149. Harbinger, 2:95-96 (Jan. 17, 1846): "Western Associations."
Account by an unnamed "professional gentleman, who has recently returned from a tour at the West"; with an editorial introduction by George Ripley.
150. Harbinger, 5:169-170 (Aug. 21, 1847): "Wisconsin Phalanx," by [L.A.(?)] Hine (dated at Ceresco, July 20).
Reprinted from N.Y. Weekly Tribune, Aug 14, 1847, p. 2; and later in part by Noyes, pp. 426-427.
151. Harbinger, 6:2 (Nov. 6, 1847): "Letter from the Wisconsin Phalanx" by Joseph J. Cooke (dated at Ceresco, Aug. 28).
Reprinted in part by Noyes, pp. 428-430, who erroneously attributed the article to the N.Y. Tribune. At a meeting in Boston on Oct. 12-13, the Committee of Thirteen of the American Union of Associationists heard an oral report by Cooke on the Wisconsin Phalanx, which was "of a less sanguine tone than letters which have been recently published", Harbinger, 5:317 (Oct. 23, 1847); quoted by Noyes (#182), p. 346.
152. Harbinger, 6:61-62 (Dec. 25, 1847): "Wisconsin Phalanx," by H. H. Van Amringe.
Reprinted from the Young American [sic; i.e., Young America].
153. Harbinger, 7:85-86, 93-94 (July 15 and 22, 1848): "Wisconsin and Wisconsin Phalanx," by H. H. Van Amringe.
Article (of greater length and importance than #152) by a leading reformer, who travelled in Wisconsin from Aug. 1847 to March 1848. An account of one of his speeches had already been reprinted from the Waukesha W. T. Freeman by the Harbinger, 6:142 (March 4, 1848).

154. Spirit of the Age (N.Y.), 1:362-365 (Dec. 8, 1849): Letter by H. H. Van Amringe (dated at Ceresco, Nov. 14).
Transmits the official "Address to the Friends of Reform and Association" (#111).
155. Mitchel, Martin, History of the County of Fond du Lac, Wis. from its earliest settlement to the present time (Fond du Lac: J. A. Smith, 1854), pp. 38-39.
Reprinted in Ripon Commonwealth, Oct 26, 1900. This part of the chapter on "Ceresco" was written by David P. Mapes, founder of Ripon.
156. Ripon Spur [formerly Herald], Aug. 24, Spet. 21, Nov. 16, 1855, and other issues.
Attacks upon Ceresco Union for espousal of free love doctrines; and report of the resulting dissolution of this Union. Cited by Pedrick, "Free Love Movement Aroused Indignation of Pioneer Riponites," Ripon Commonwealth, Nov. 16, 1934. The Ripon Herald was founded in Dec. 1853; was taken over by E.L. Runals and E.T. Goodrich in July, 1855, in order to attack the Ceresco Union, its name being changed to the Ripon Spur; and was sold in Jan. 1857, and rechristened the Ripon Home. After changing hands and names several times again, the newspaper finally became the Ripon Commonwealth, and has been issued continuously under that name since Jan. 22, 1864.
157. Mapes, David P., History of the City of Ripon, and of its Founder, David P. Mapes, with his Opinion of Men and Manners of the Day (Milwaukee, 1873), pp. 66-82. "The Founding of Ripon," chap. IV, pp. 83-95; "Ceresco," chap. V, Pedrick Transcripts, Miscellaneous, pp. 79-91.
Chap. IV consist of Mapes' contribution to Mitchel's History (#155). Chap. V is an account by Everett Chamberlin, extracted "from a Ripon paper of April 11th, 1873."
158. Miller, W[esson] G[age], Thirty Years in the Itinerancy (Milwaukee, I. R. Hauser & Co., 1875), pp. 49-54, chap. V, in part. [Pedrick Transcripts, Miscellaneous, pp. 69-72 (tr)].
Describes home missionary work at Ceresco in 1845. Reprinted in part by Pedrick in Proceedings (#186), pp. 219-220.
159. [Shaw, William R.], "Historical Papers," Nos. II-V, Ripon Commonwealth, Nov. 20, 27, Dec. 4, 11, 1885. Pedrick Transcripts, Miscellaneous, pp. 92-103.
Based in part on recollections of members, with quotations also from "a Chicago daily of recent date," and from Noyes. The above papers were undoubtedly written by William B. Shaw, a Ripon young man at the time, who had then recently graduated from Oberlin College.... He soon thereafter entered journalistic work, and for many years was on the Review of Reviews under Albert Shaw, in New York City.

160. May, A.M., [Reminiscences], Ripon Commonwealth, Oct. 26, Nov. 2, 1906. Reprinted Nov. 11, 1938. Recollections of buildings and scenes at Coresco, observed while he was a boy, living near Dartford.

D. OTHER CONTEMPORARY PUBLISHED ACCOUNTS

161. Phalanx, unnumbered page before p. 59 (verso of title page, Feb. 5, 1844): "Fourier Association."
Reprinted from Southport American: "Mr. Parnell's Lecture."
162. Phalanx, p. 148 (May 18, 1844): "Wisconsin Phalanx."
Reprinted from Green Bay Republican, April 30, 1844; reprinted in N.Y. Weekly Tribune, June 1, 1844, p. 3; and later by Noyes, pp. 411-412.
163. Phalanx, p. 195 (June 29, 1844).
Reprinted from Southport Telegraph. Compares advantages of Wisconsin over Ohio Phalanx.
164. Niles' National Register (Washington, D. C.), 66:(5th ser., 16), 278 (June 29, 1844): "Wisconsin.-Phalanx. Southport" (dated May 25).
Reprinted from Southport American.
165. N.Y. Weekly Tribune, June 29, 1844, p. 2: "Wisconsin Phalanx."
166. N.Y. Weekly Tribune, Oct. 19, 1844, p. 2: "Wisconsin Phalanx."
167. Madison (Wisconsin) Argus, Feb. 4, 8, 1845.
Reports of debates in the Territorial Council on the Wisconsin Phalanx charter. The Argus opposed the bill and printed hostile editorials as well as these news reports; see [Warren Chase], Life-Line of the Lone One (#144), p. 121.
168. N.Y. Weekly Tribune, March 1, 1845, p. 4.
169. N.Y. Weekly Tribune, July 12, 1845, p. 4: "Progress of Association."
Account of anniversary celebration at Wisconsin Phalanx, May 27, as reported in extra of the Prairieville American Freeman.
170. Harbinger, 1:192 (Aug. 30, 1845): "Wisconsin Phalanx."
Reprinted from Ohio American, Cleveland; reprinted by Noyes, pp. 415-416. Denies report of failure.
171. Harbinger, 2:47 (Dec. 27, 1845): "Wisconsin Phalanx," [by George Ripley].
Editorial introduction to annual statement (#106).

172. N.Y. Weekly Tribune, May 2, 1846, p. 1.
Paragraph, based on Harbinger.
173. Harbinger, 3:257 (Oct. 3, 1846): "Correspondence," signed "E."
(dated at Chicago, Ill., Sept. 12).
174. Harbinger, 3:336 (Oct. 31, 1846): "Well Done, Wisconsin!" (by George Ripley).
Reports that constitution of the "Ceresco Union of Associationists," signed by 84 names, has been received by national headquarters.
175. Harbinger, 4:79 (Jan. 9, 1847): "Wisconsin Phalanx," [by George Ripley].
Editorial introduction to annual statement (#107).
176. Harbinger, 4:336 (May 1, 1847): "Wisconsin Phalanx."
Reprinted from True Tocsin, Ann Arbor, Mich.
177. Harbinger, 4:388, 390 (May 29, 1847).
References, at the annual meeting of the American Union of Associationists, to the Wisconsin Phalanx as one of three surviving associations.
178. N.Y. Weekly Tribune, July 17, 1847, p. 4: "Letters from the North-West," by Horace Greeley, No. 7 (dated at Milwaukee, July 3).
Greeley expresses regret that he could not visit the Wisconsin Phalanx.
179. Harbinger, 5:326-327 (Oct. 30, 1847); Greeley, Horace, "Co-operative Life in America."
Reprinted from People's Journal (London), 4:167-168 (Sept. 18, 1847).
Reprinted in part by Moyes, pp. 560-561.
Dated at New York, July 29, 1847. Mentions Wisconsin Phalanx among three Fourier Associations that "give some promise of vitality."
180. Harbinger, 7:60-61 (June 24, 1848): "An Inquiry."
181. Harbinger, 7:76 (July 8, 1848): "Wisconsin Phalanx," [by George Ripley].
Denies unfriendly attitude attributed to the Harbinger by Warren Chase.

II. Secondary Works

All of these are available on reserve in the reading room of the Historical Society. In addition, Noyes' History of American Socialisms (#182) is available in paperback.

This list of secondary works is incomplete, but it does include all those of any real value.

182. Noyes, Johan Humphrey, History of American Socialisms: (Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1870), pp. 411- 448: "The Wisconsin Phalanx" (chap. XXXV).
This chapter was first printed in The Circular (Oneida Community), (n.s.), 6:92-96 (June 7, 1869). Based on Macdonald MSS. and articles in Phalanx and Harbinger, many of which are extensively quoted, as indicated by citations in the present bibliography.
183. [Butterfield, C. W.], The History of Fond du Lac County, Wisconsin (Chicago, Western Historical Co., 1880), pp. 400-408: "The Wisconsin Phalanx"; also incidental references on pp. 671, 673, 684, 689, 692; and biographical sketches on pp. 485, 881, 887, 891, 895, 897-898, 908, 912.
184. Legler, Henry E., Leading Events of Wisconsin History: The Story of the State (Milwaukee, Sentinel Co., 1898), pp. 189-195. "A Modern Utopia," (chap. IX).
185. Sparks, Edwin Erle, The Expansion of the American People, Social and Territorial (Chicago, etc.; Scott, Foresman & Co. .cop. 1900]), pp. 395-401: "Seeking Utopia in America," (chap. XXXII, part).
This chapter was originally published in The Chautauquan, 31: (n.s.), 22, 156-161 (May, 1900).
186. Pedrick, S. M., "The Wisconsin Phalanx at Ceresco," Wisconsin, Historical Society, Proceedings, 1902, 190-226.
Also published as a separate reprint: S. M. Pedrick, The Wisconsin Phalanx at Ceresco (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1903).
This remains the best and most accessible account, based on the original sources. Since the article was written, however, its author has discovered and published a large amount of additional source material bearing upon the Wisconsin Phalanx, including the second volume of the MS. Secretary Record.
187. Hillquit, Morris, History of Socialism in the United States (N.Y., London, Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1903), pp. 101-103: "The Wisconsin Phalanx, or Ceresco."

188. [Campbell, Henry Colin], Wisconsin in Three Centuries, 1634-1905 (N.Y., Century Historical Co. [cop. 1906]), 3:105-121: "The Bursting of Utopian Bubbles," (chap. 7:105-117, deals with Wisconsin Phalanx.)
189. Hinds, William Alfred, American Communities and Co-operative Colonies (2d revision [i.e., 3d ed.]; Chicago, Charles H. Kerr Co, 1908), pp. 281-287: "The Wisconsin Phalanx."
190. Commons, John R., and others, eds., A Documentary History of American Industrial Society (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1909-1911), 7:147-150: "Owenism and Association. Introduction," [by John R. Commons]. Devotes considerable attention to Wisconsin Phalanx. See also the source materials reprinted on pp. 263-273, 282-284 (cited in proper places above).
191. Schafer, Joseph, "The Wisconsin Phalanx", Wisconsin Magazine of History, 19:454-474 (June, 1936).
Published under "Editorial Comment." Includes portrait of Warren Chase. Based on transcript of MS. Record Book, Michael Frank's diary, and contemporary newspapers.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
Department of History

History 290

Mr. Katz

Ceresco Microfilms

Unpublished material

- Reel 1: Secretary's manuscript record of minutes and proceedings, 1844-1857. [Short title: Ms. Secretary's Record]
Reel 2: Typescript of the above Secretary's Record.
[Short title: Typescript Secretary's Record]
Reels 3-4: Various manuscript records of the Wisconsin Phalanx.
[Short title: Manuscript Records]
Reel 5: MacDonald Manuscripts (Records of Ceresco and other experimental communities). [Short title: MacDonald Mss.]

Periodicals

- Reel 6: The Phalanx, 1843-1844 (New York).
Reels 7-9: The Harbinger, 1845-1849 (Brook Farm and New York).
Reels 10-11: Southport Telegraph, 1843-1850 (Southport [i.e. Kenosha], Wis.).
Reel 12: Wisconsin Argus, 1844-1845 (Madison)

Books

- Reel 13: Warren Chase, The Life-Line of the Lone One. (9th ed., 1886; originally published Boston, 1857).
[Short title: Chase, Life-Line]

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
Department of History

History 290

Mr. Katz

Ceresco Microfilms: a Calendar

REEL 1

Wisconsin Phalanx, Record Book [Secretary's Record]; 2 volumes:

vol. I, March 23, 1844 - November 29, 1847 (251 pages)

vol. II, Dec. 13, 1847 - July 18, 1857 (140 pages)

Contents:

vol. I. pp. 1-12: Constitution and Bye-laws

pp. 13-235: Minutes of the meetings of the Board of Directors
(later known as the Council), March 1844 - Nov. 1847

pp. 238-251: Minutes of the Stockholders' meetings,
May 1844 - March 1845

vol. II. pp. 1-140: Minutes of the Council meetings, Dec. 1847 -
July 1857. [Note: virtually all of these
minutes (i.e. pp. 1-137) cover meetings held
before 1851. The years 1851-1857 are covered
in the last three pages.]

This is the most important single source for the history of the Wisconsin Phalanx. The volumes comprise minutes of meetings both of the directors (later the council) and of the stockholders, from the earliest organization of the Phalanx as an unincorporated association, through its life as a corporation, to the final winding up of its affairs. In addition to the minutes, these volumes contain the texts in manuscript of a large number of important single documents, especially:

a) Constitution and By-Laws, latter adopted Mar. 25, 1844 (1:1-12); presumably the ones printed in 1844 (#4048) of which no copies survive.

b) By-Laws, adopted by Council Apr. 24, 1845, by members Apr. 29 (1:57-60); printed on broadside (#4050).

c) By-Laws, adopted Feb. 21, 1848 (2:14-16); printed on #4054.

d) By-Laws, adopted Dec. 9, 1848 (2:63-66); apparently never printed.

e) Act of Incorporation (1:40-46), see #4049.

Ceresco Calendar -- 2

- f) Amendment to Act of Incorporation (2:117 3/4), see #4057.
- g) Standing Rules of the Council, Dec. 15, 1846 (1:164-165); readopted Dec. 14, 1847 (2:2-3).
- h) Rules and Regulations for the Admission of Members (including Covenant), Feb. 21, 1848 (2:16-18); printed on #4054.
- i) Preamble and Resolutions of unincorporated Phalanx transferring property to corporation, passed by directors Feb. 14, 1845 (1:34-36), and by stockholders Feb. 17 (1:245-246).
- j) Resolutions of corporation to purchase assets of unincorporated Phalanx, Feb. 18, 1845 (1:47-48).
- k) Treasurers' bonds (1:249 ff.).

REEL 2 (1 item)

Typescript of Wisconsin Phalanx, Record Book [Secretary's Record]
(see Reel 1).

REEL 3 (11 items)

1. Record of Births and Deaths [and Removals]. 30 pages.

Left-hand pages contain columns for place and date of birth of members of the community, and the date of their arrival at Ceresco. Adjoining right-hand pages contain columns for date and cause of death (if this occurred at Ceresco) or the date of departure from the community.

1a. Original Receipts from Shareholders on final settlement and cancelling of stock and accounts. 5 pages (dated January 1852).

This is included in the same volume as the preceding Record of Births and Deaths, and it is paginated continuously with that Record as pp. 31-35.

2. Stock Book of the Wisconsin Phalanx. 147 pages, (plus index).

Pages 1-7 contain "An Act to Incorporate the Wisconsin Phalanx", which is not actually part of the stock records but which contains the legal requirements governing purchase and sale of stock, as established by the Wisconsin territorial legislature when it granted the Phalanx its corporate charter. (This Act of Incorporation can be found in other places as well, including the Secretary's Record.)

The actual stock book occupies the remaining 140 pages. It is arranged as follows: each individual who purchased stock in the Phalanx at any time is given an entire page to himself. On this page is listed all the stock purchased and/or sold by this individual during his entire association with the community. The following information is recorded: Stock purchased, date of purchase, "of whom bought", number of shares, amount of money; Stock sold, date of sale, "to whom transferred", number of shares, amount of money.

An alphabetical index of stockholders, and the pages on which their transactions are recorded, is included at the very beginning of the Stock Book.

3. Record Book of [Stock] Transfers. 243 pages.

The first 13 pages contain "An Act to Incorporate the Wisconsin Phalanx" (see above, item 2). The next 9 pages contain a list of charter subscribers to stock in the Wisconsin Phalanx (i.e. those persons who purchased stock between February and October 1845): this list includes the subscriber's name, date of purchase, number of shares, and the amount of money paid.

The rest of the book (221 pages) contains "A Record of the Transfer of Stock in the Wisconsin Phalanx" between March 1845 and September 1850. Unlike item two (which it ultimately duplicates) this Record is arranged chronologically, and it contains the actual legal contracts for each transfer of stock. It is comprised of legal prose, and in it the day-to-day purchase and sale of stock can be followed. There is no index. (The final settlements of stock in 1852 can be found in item 1a above.)

REEL 3 (continued)

4. Record of Deeds, Duplicates, Transfers, and Mortgages to the Wisconsin Phalanx. 62 pages.

Contains land titles from May 1844 to August 1848.

5. General Ledger of the Wisconsin Phalanx. 277 pages (plus index). 1846-1852.

A record of individual debts to and credits from the Phalanx. Like the Stock Book (item 2), this Ledger is arranged by individuals, each with one or more pages to himself. At the end of each year his debts to the Phalanx are balanced with his portion of community earnings.

An alphabetical index of members, and the pages on which their debits and credits are recorded, is included at the beginning of the Ledger.

6. General Agent's Account...of Receipts and Expenditures. 58 pages. December 1848 - December 1852.

The bulk of this account (pp. 1-51) covers the single year 1849. Pp. 1-48 (1848-1849) are kept by William Starr. Pp. 49-58 (1849-1852) are kept by Warren Chase. At the end of this account are seven unrelated pages in Chase's hand.

7. Treasurer's Account of Receipts and Disbursements. 38 pages. 1848-1854.

A chronological ledger-book, which duplicates the material found in the General Ledger (item 6), except that it is arranged chronologically rather than by individuals. (This item stands in the same relation to item 6 that item 3 stands to item 2.)

8. Day Book of Jacob Woodruff (Blacksmith). 180 pages. 1849-1852.

A chronological ledger-book kept by a member of the community who worked largely as a blacksmith.

9. Horticultural Account Book. 124 pages. 1848-1869[sic].

A ledger of funds spent on agriculture. Note: Only the first 32 pages cover years that are relevant (1848-1854), and even most of this material covers the years 1851-1854. The 92 pages that follow are unrelated to Ceresco and are written in another hand. (Following these 92 pages are another 33 pages of miscellaneous unrelated materials.)

10. Original deeds to land pertaining to the Wisconsin Phalanx. 18 frames. 1845-1846. (See also item 4)

11. Miscellaneous Records of the Wisconsin Phalanx Society. 17 frames.

These concern financial matters.

REEL 4 (7 items)

1. Recollections of early settlers. 86 pages.

This consist of six interviews with members of the community and others about life at Ceresco. The interviews were conducted by Kidder in and shortly before 1906, and they were recorded by him in this manuscript.

Note: While the actual interviews occupy only 86 pages, they are preceded by 206 pages of wholly irrelevant matter that need not have been filmed. The actual interviews begin only on p. 209 and continue to p. 295.

The subjects of the interviews are as follows:

- a. Richard Dart (born 1828), pp. 209-259.
- b. Mrs. Robert D. Mason (a member of the community), pp. 260-267.
- c. Chester Adkins (a member), pp. 267-268.
- d. Henry Burling, pp. 269-271.
- e. Mrs. Nettie Pedrick Baldwin, pp. 273-275.
- f. J. D. Barlow, pp. 276-295.

2. Diary of Michael Frank (July 20, 1843 - December 31, 1847). 261 pages.

While he never joined the Phalanx, Frank was active in the organizations that conceived it. He was a member the Franklin Lyceum at Southport when Fourierism and other reforms were debated there, and he was chairman of the committee that drafted the Fourierist constitution of March, 1844. (see Secretary's Record [Reel 2], document a.) In addition Frank was a member of the Wisconsin territorial legislature during the mid-1840's. His diary is an important source for intellectual and institutional currents in Southport.

3. Miscellaneous Materials from the Pedrick Collection of Ceresco materials. 192 pages.

S. M. Pedrick was a native of Ripon, Wisconsin (the cite of the Ceresco community) who collected a substantial body of materials about the community early in the present century. The following items are included:

- a. Annual Statement of the Condition and Progress of the Wisconsin Phalanx, for the Fiscal Year ending December 7, 1846. pp. 3-5. (Also found in Harbinger, IV, 79-80).
- b. Letter from W. W. Wheeler to Warren Chase, September 23, 1844. pp 56-57.
- c. Frank A. Flower, "Fourierism in Wisconsin", Magazine of Western History, February 1887. pp. 63-68.

REEL 4 (continued)

3. Miscellaneous Materials from the Pedrick Collection (continued)

- d. "The Ceresco Community", New York Evening Post, February 25, 1899. p. 73.
- e. Letter from Franklin G. Sherrill to the...American Home Missionary Society in New York, January 16, 1851. pp. 74-78.
- f. "Ceresco", Ripon Commonwealth, 1885. pp. 92-103.
- g. Extracts from the Journals of the Rev. Cutting Marsh, May-June 1850. p. 104.
- h. "Ceresco", a chapter from Martin Mitchel's History of Fond du Lac County (1854), from Ripon Commonwealth, October 1906. pp. 105-106.
- i. S. M. Pedrick, "The Story of Ripon", (1902). pp. 144-149.
- j. Obituary of Mrs. Chester Adkins, nee Elizabeth Limbert, Ripon Commonwealth, August 1903. p. 149.
- k. Mrs. Ada C. Merrell, "Chester Adkins and the Ceresco Community," Ripon Commonwealth, January 1904. pp. 150-152. (See also Reel 4, item 1c)
- l. Interview with Mrs. Nathan Hunter, Ripon Commonwealth, October 1904. pp. 153-154.
- m. "Ceresco Pilgrimage", Ripon Commonwealth, October 1904. p. 155.
- n. "More Historical Matters", Ripon Commonwealth, December 1905. p. 156.
- o. Letter from Warren Chase, quoted in Increase Lapham's Wisconsin (1846), pp. 157-158. p. 157.
- p. S. M. Pedrick, "Free Love Movement in Ceresco", Ripon Commonwealth, February, 1906. pp. 158-159.
- q. "Wisconsin Phalanx" (letters of Warren Chase to the Phalanx and the Harbinger, q.v.), Ripon Commonwealth, February, 1907. pp. 159-161.
- r. Horace E. Rounds, "Free Love Ended Ceresco Colony", Ripon Commonwealth, 1910. pp. 161-162.
- s. "Ripon Settled Seventy Years Ago" (letters of George Stebbins to the Southport Telegraph and Warren Chase to the New York Tribune), Ripon Commonwealth, May 1914. pp. 162-163.
- t. Letter from Fanny E. Blakely to S. M. Pedrick, 1919. (Mrs. Blakely was the daughter of David B. Dunham, a member of the community). pp. 164-165.

REEL 4 (continued)

3. Miscellaneous Materials from the Pedrick Collection (continued)

- u. "Anniversary of Ripon is Celebrated", Ripon Press, 1919. pp. 166-167½.
- v. E. G. Doudna, "Dramatic Events in Wisconsin History, a Debate Results in an Experimental Utopia", Wisconsin Journal of Education, LX (1928). p. 168.
- w. Frank Zufeldt, "The Pigeon River Fourier Colony", Sheboygan Press, 1931. p. 169.
- x. "Depression of '40's Built Arcadia Here..." Milwaukee Journal, 1933. pp. 170-172.
- y. Wisconsin Phalanx, Act of Incorporation and By-Laws (printed copy). pp. 173-174. (The printed version of materials found in several other places as well.)
- z. Francis Mason Alensworth, "Six Years of Communal Life", (Typescript copy of an address delivered in 1939.) pp. 175-192.

4. Charlotte Haven Mason Letters, 1846. 8 pages.

Typescript of four letters written by a young lady from Ceresco.

5. William H. Stillwell Letters, 1846. 12 pages.

Three manuscript letters.

6. Sheldon Letters, 1847-1848. 3 pages.

Typescripts of excerpts from three letters.

7. Ceresco Letters, 1845-1846. 25 pages.

Six manuscript letters collected by G. W. Lambert; written by the following persons:

- a. Alex B. Postin, August 4, 1845.
- b. Nathan H. Strong, January 5,
- c. Solomon L. de Silva, October 3,
- d. O. H. Capron, October 23, 1845
- e. Hiram de Silva, June 14, 1846
- f. A. Holmes, January 15, 1846.

REEL 5

Mac Donald Manuscripts.

740 pages.

Early in the 1850's A. J. MacDonald, a Scottish-born Owenite socialist, began to collect material about all the American experimental communities which had existed up to that time. He intended to publish the results as a kind of guide-book for any future communities, but he died while the collection was still in manuscript form. Some years later John Humphrey Noyes used MacDonald's manuscript as the basis for his own History of American Socialisms (1870).

Material on the Wisconsin Phalanx can be found on pp. 188-207 of the MacDonald Manuscripts. Most of this material (pp. 188-202) consists of a narrative history of the Phalanx, written presumably by MacDonald himself. (This account was substantially included in Noyes' History, pp. 440-448, where it was incorrectly attributed to "a member" of the Phalanx.) The remaining pages (pp. 203-207) contain a small amount of primary material--a published letter of L. H. Capron and a printed copy of the Act of Incorporation (for manuscript copies see Reels 1-3).

In addition to the section on the Wisconsin Phalanx, the Manuscripts of course contain an enormous amount of material about other experimental communities. (Much but not all of this material can be found also in Noyes.) An alphabetical index by community is located at the end of the Manuscript. Material relating to other Wisconsin communities appears on pp. 382-388. A published letter of C. L. Sholes (sometime editor of the Southport Telegraph) appears on p. 456.

Further information about the MacDonald Manuscripts can be found in the first two chapters (pp. 1-20) of Noyes' History of American Socialisms.

REEL 6

The Phalanx

A Fourierist magazine published in New York City during 1843 and 1844, before the establishment of the Ceresco community but a time when plans for it were being made. While the magazine should be useful primarily for information about the emergence of American Fourierism, it does contain a number of items relating specifically to the creation of the Wisconsin Phalanx. These items are as follows (for a more detailed account see the accompanying Bibliography of Published Sources):

REEL 6 (continued)

The Phalanx (continued).

Feb. 5, 1844 (pp. 70-71): Report of a "Meeting of the Friends of Association" in Southport, including a set of resolutions providing for the establishment of a Fourier Club in the town; also the by-laws of that Club.

Feb. 5, 1844 (unnumbered page before p. 59): Report of a lecture delivered to the Southport Fourier Club.

May 18, 1844 (p. 148): Report on the Wisconsin Phalanx. (This is also printed in Noyes, History of American Socialisms, pp. 411-412).

June 29, 1844 (p. 195): Item on the advantages of the Wisconsin Phalanx over the Ohio Phalanx.

June 29, 1844 (p. 189): Report on the Wisconsin Phalanx. (Also printed in Noyes, pp. 412-414; originally printed in the Southport Telegraph).

Oct. 17, 1844 (pp. 280-281): Letter of Warren Chase. (Also excerpted in Noyes, pp. 414-415).

REELS 7-9

The Harbinger. 8 volumes.

Reel 7: Volume I (1845)

Reel 8: Volumes II-V (1845-1847)

Reel 9: Volumes VI-VIII (1847-1849)

This magazine replaced The Phalanx as the unofficial "organ" of American Fourierism. Published first at the Brook Farm community outside Boston, it was transferred to New York City shortly after the failure of Brook Farm in 1846. It continued publication until 1849, thus spanning virtually the whole existence of the Ceresco community.

The Harbinger contains a great deal of material about Fourierism in general and about Ceresco in particular, much of it reprinted from other sources and some of it in turn reprinted elsewhere (for instance, in Noyes' History of American Socialisms). For a topical and chronological index of Ceresco material to be found in the The Harbinger, see the accompanying Bibliography of Published Sources.

REELS 10-11

Southport Telegraph.

Reel 10: September 5, 1843 - June 23, 1847

Reel 11: July 7, 1847 - June 21, 1850

Published in the town which spawned the Wisconsin Phalanx, the Telegraph was edited through the early 1840's by C. L. Sholes, whose own sympathy to Fourierism was at least partly instrumental in creating the Phalanx. The Telegraph published a good deal of material about the Phalanx. In addition, the process by which Ceresco came into being, institutionally and intellectually, can be traced in this newspaper (as it can be traced in Michael Frank's diary--see Reel 4) at least as early as 1843. This material is substantially un-indexed in the accompanying Bibliography of Published Sources.

Note: The Southport Telegraph was published before mid-1843 and after 1850--the terminal dates of the run of issues included in the Ceresco microfilms. Any issues which fall outside these two terminal dates are available in the State Historical Society via the normal channels (i.e. the card catalogue in the reading room).

REEL 12

Wisconsin Argus. 1844-1845.

Published in Madison, the Argus is useful chiefly for its accounts of the territorial legislature's debates on the proposed corporate charter of the Wisconsin Phalanx early in 1845, and for its own editorials on this debate. See especially the issues of February 4 and February 8, 1845.

REEL 13

Warren Chase, The Life-Line of the Lone One; or, Autobiography of the World's Child, 9th edition, Boston, 1886 (originally published Boston, 1857).

The autobiography of one of the central figures from the Wisconsin Phalanx. Chase became a prominent "spiritualist" during the 1850's, and in this book he discusses his years at Ceresco as a step on his path to spiritualism. Chase was the one individual to come out of Ceresco who attained any degree of national attention; his autobiography went through ten editions.

Material that is specifically concerned with the Ceresco community can be found on pp. 112-130.

Appendix IV

Salem: First Paper

Write a brief (3-page) biography of one of the accused witches whose trial evidence is recorded in Levin, pp.3-80.

To write this biography, reconstruct as best you can the past life of the accused witch, and her (or his) relation to the Salem community. For evidence use any information you can glean from the testimony. Whether this information is revealed directly, in passing, or by implication. Your job, in other words, is to change one kind of story (the record of a trial) into another kind of story (the record of a life). One procedure to avoid is writing a narrative account of the trial, or a summation of the evidence presented against the accused witch.

In preparing for the paper you need not go outside the assigned section of the Levin book. Don't bother to provide any annotation (footnotes), but try to remember where it was in the testimony that you got your evidence. No more than three pages (typed, double-spaced).

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
Department of History
September 27-28, 1966

History 290

Mr. Katz

Salem: Second Paper

Write an essay in which you examine evidence presented against the witch you have chosen in terms of the nature of her relationships with those who testified against her. How do these relationships affect the character of the testimony? You may limit yourself to the testimonies of 1 or 2 individuals.

Three to five pages (typed, double-spaced, in duplicate.) Due in your instructor's mailbox (next to the History Department office in Bascom Hall) by 5 p.m. two days before your seminar is to meet next week (i.e. Wednesday sections due 5 p.m. Monday, Oct. 2; Thursday sections due 5 p.m. Tuesday, Oct. 3).

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
Department of History
October 10-11, 1966

History 290

Mr. Katz

Salem: Third Paper

Was it possible for a devout Puritan to question the legitimacy of the Salem trials? On what grounds could he do so? Did any of the opposition seem to come from a non-Puritan position?

Choose one (1) passage from Cotton Mather, and two (2) passages from the rest of your reading (Increase Mather, Calef, Brattle, Phips, and Hale), each of which seems representative of a different kind of position. Write a paper, about the opposition, based entirely on an analysis of the three (3) passages you have chosen.

Five (5) pages. Be sure to copy out the three passages at the beginning of your paper. Due next week, same time, same place, in duplicate.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
Department of History
Week of October 30, 1967

History 290

Mr. Katz

Salem: Fourth Paper

Historians since 1692 have accounted in different ways for the Salem witch trials. These historians include:

Deodat Lawson
Increase Mather
Cotton Mather
William Phips
Thomas Brattle
Robert Calef
Samuel Sewell
John Hale
Perry Miller
Marion Starkey
David Levin (Introduction)
H. R. Trevor-Roper
Yourself (your two first papers)

How has each of these historians accounted for the trials, and on which group or individual has each of them placed the heaviest burden of responsibility for what happened in Salem? Does any of these accounts seem to provide an adequate explanation? Do you have your own explanation? Spend roughly half your paper discussing the explanation you find most credible by applying it to the witch you have already studied.

Not to exceed 10 pages. Due the week of Oct. 30, same time, same place.

Staff Meeting, April 17, 1967

Last week?

Neil: Mine (classes) were quite dull, their responses were perfunctory...

Taylor: Mine was slow starting, but I felt it was a good class. I don't think they began to really respond to the material until we started talking about the document, though, because although they were willing to suggest things, no one wanted to read what he had written in the first 45 minutes of the class. They seemed to have forgotten what we had done with the minutes; they kept wondering about the substantive things, about the people. The session was half over before it got interesting, when someone asserted that the head worker was trying to sell the idea of a house in the country to the members of the council. It was only then that we could get into the document. We went into the phrasing of the third option (that of the house), where instead of introducing it with "we might" or "we may" as in the other two options, which he quickly passes over, he says "it has been suggested". We underlined phrases characterizing the nature of the proposal. The extent to which there is a preoccupation with matters of expense suggests that the council is being appealed to according to their characteristic financial considerations.

Jane Bortnick thought she detected an increased importance of the HW from the earlier minutes, but after some discussion she retracted this assumption. In this way, we had before us the question of exactly what he did do, (did he vote, for instance?) and it gave us a way of looking at his role as far as the council was concerned. We approached it through what appeared to be a facade, which could be broken down by a closer examination of his use of the pronoun "we". Sometimes "we" referred to the HW and the council, sometimes to the HW speaking for the residents, who obviously wanted the house in the country. They concluded that his suggestion about the summer house was heavily weighted, and went on to say that there was a defensive quality about the way in which the pronouns provided this facade. We then tried switching the pronouns, changing the HW's references to himself and the residents to "we" and to the council as "you". The ambiguity of the pronouns indicated a great deal about the HW.

Then we went back to the minutes, and found that the proposal of the HW was not considered in the way he had hoped it would be. The HW recommends that his proposal be turned over to himself for consideration, but the council turns it over to a committee. I suggested that they change the phrasing of the council's resolution to make it more favorable to the HW.

Two people assumed from the first sentence that the document was a report on the clubs and classes; in other words they skipped over the word "herewith."

Steve: Mine keep wanting to go beyond the document.

Taylor: I don't block mine when they want to.

Steve: I try to restrict them to questions that they can answer now, in other words, questions that arise from the document in particular that we are dealing with. I've been insisting that the rationale for the use of these documents is to be able to go on to another document, or to be able to answer questions that arise from it alone and can be answered by it alone. The result was almost mutiny last week.

Taylor: Mine show interest in questions of substance, but they often don't follow them up, they don't go on to try to answer them. They drop it because they know they can't do much about it. They show a lot of interest about things that you might expect them to, about things which concern them directly in some way, such as the fact that many of the people on the council were professors. When we come to the second document in this packet where the three classes of students are mentioned, I'm sure that their interest in the professors will come up again.

Neil: They're bored, I'm bored; they either lose interest or run off into substantive questions, I guess that's the third level. All we got at in this class was that a facade existed. Are we leaving this document?

Taylor: We might as well bring this out into the open -- we've disagreed about it for so long. The way a document comes to life by the vagueries and expressions is still a simple matter of rhetorical exercise to you. Over and over again, the thing to do is to confront the document as a living expression, rather than as some dry piece of evidence that must be squeezed. An approach arises out of a necessary repetition of tactics and so forth. I sense not so much as a boredom with the process or with the documents the fact that we're not going anywhere.

Scott: They find the activity exciting, though their excitement tends to lag. We haven't asked them to order anything yet. They're adept enough in class, while in their papers they fall away. Somehow the class experience is still not relevant to the papers.

Steve: Mine think that two weeks is too long on the minutes. It's not that the minutes aren't worth it, but that they don't feel that they can get enough of a sense of where they are going by staying on one document so long.

Neil: Did anyone find their class interesting?

.....
You see, the whole thing, whether we like to admit it or not, depends on either a good teacher who is consistent, or the day you come in, what your state of mind is. If you come in alert and ready, you can elicit almost anything from any document. If not, the session is inevitably not good.

Taylor: Mine can quickly see what you've worked out before hand. The class depends on having something happen in which you participate. If they can feel that you have planned something, or that you know something you don't know, the experience of the class is ruined.

Neil: Yes, but if we're going to give this out as a principle for others, and we must keep this in mind, can we say that as a prerequisite you must not know your material?

Steve: It would almost mean that you'd have to have new material each year.

Taylor: You forget a lot year to year.

Neil: We might as well face the fact that we represent the top two percent or so of the history graduate students, in terms of deftness of just messing around with the material. Shouldn't we want to eliminate this as a variable or as a determinant factor? Shouldn't we pick more intrinsically interesting documents? The idea being, if you're low, the documents should be there.

Taylor: A star system for documents is dangerous...intrinsically interesting to whom?

Neil: A document which is written in an artful way, or one which is meant to persuade and great attention is paid to its evocative effect will be more interesting 99% of the time than the documents we're studying now.

Scott: I disagree. I never knew how much could come from one page of these things.

Neil: The second we do move on from texture to questions about the action underneath, to hypotheses, to potentially researchable questions, we'll know what the problem is.

Taylor: We had a discussion about two weeks ago, provoked by Walter Harp, which seems to me to explain part of their ability to endure. We can let their minds continue to play, we can withhold judgement about what's happening to them, but there's a development of something which became acute this one day. It has to do with the question of whether in fact anything is going on behind the material in front of them. We have one real sceptic in our group, who keeps us on our toes, who asked, "How do we know anything from this document?" How do we know the settlement ever really existed? This kind of question can be roughly approximated with any document. How do we know that any document attests to anything? I don't think the presence of rhetoric changes anything.

Neil: What about the quality of the rhetoric? I just think that the mere mechanics of what we're doing--working with students and trying to keep them going--aren't we weighing things against ourselves by using this workaday stuff?

Scott: The problem of emphasis on the documents themselves, or of being able to move from one document to another could be solved by finding groups of people who worked together.

Dave: It's an alternative, I must admit.

Taylor: It deflects things away from what I'm trying to do. It's not history. Anything contributing to history is a legitimate object of study.

Neil: Adams diary is more exciting a piece contributing to history than this stuff, however.

Taylor: I don't find it more exciting. If the problem can be likened to a zoology course where we as instructors of zoology don't understand the relationship between earthworms that we're dissecting to the rest of zoology, we're defensive because we don't know. The answer is not to bring in a cyclotron to a physics lab where the same problem exists.

Steve: What if we knew more about the subject the document deals with?

Neil: I find they look to you for answers when this is the case. This is just what we're trying to get away from.

Steve: If you knew more about the document, you could do more methodologically.

Taylor: What if we had a subject that was closer to the experience of the students?

Neil: Yes, a problem area in history that they'd be interested in just by virtue of who they are...something like the Manhattan Project...

Taylor: I responded viscerally against this sort of thing when it was proposed last summer, (it was the Warren Report at that time) but...

Neil: I was hooting this down then too, but I'm not so sure I would now.

Scott: The problem is not what materials we have, but where we go with it. We chose Salem for it's intrinsic drama. Even if we got the Warren Report we would still have to define where we were going, and we'd probably have to deal with the same problems.

Steve: Are we changing the materials for the kids' interest, or our own?

Taylor: Say we took the Yale thing Steve is working on...the same problems would arise.

Steve: Everything we propose is exciting until they get to it.

Neil: During Ceresco the classroom response broke down and we had to fall back on a seminar kind of thing with questions which would lead to research, and assigning them to go out and research it. Maybe we can come up with some significant questions because they arise out of the material itself.

Taylor: This is all in the order of baiting the hook...it shouldn't be a question of bait but of the way we fish.

Steve: Is our way of fishing so wrong?

Taylor: It's still an evasion. The longer we put off this problem with artifices, etc., the longer we put off our problem.

Neil: I disagree.

Taylor: If it's all a matter of the relationship between documentary expression and social experience, do we close in on a small body of documents and put questions to them about how they reveal a certain social experience? Or do we work with documents and allow them to suppose that eventually they'll know something about settlements, and the university settlement? Do we continue to tantalize their legitimate expectations? Is there a way of keeping them from this kind of crude accumulation of data? Or is there a way we can keep the relationship going between the settlement society and the documents--a way of keeping the documents alive...the idea that an historian never really knows anything about which he's studying. He is researching it in order to form an idea about it, rather than in order to be able to describe it. History courses now don't lead to any questioning of this kind of existential delivery of concepts (like the New Deal, etc.) and students are never led to wonder about any kind of concrete social experience which lies beneath what they read.

One thing about using humble documents is that the wondering can be kept alive. You'll never be able to categorize the past. You can get closer to an imaginable social event, still rather obscure, (eg. see the different Reynolds which emerges in each document, according to the group to which he is

speaking) and they would begin to see what was accidentally discovered in the minutes: that who the secretary is speaking to makes a difference. He speaks syntactically differently to each group he addresses.

What you don't get about Adams by examining his diary, is everything that is missing in the diary, in other words the totality of Adams' experience... the papers....etc...

Steve: You're imposing your idea of history, which is more on the order of A Brechtian epic than the dramatic. It's just that you're seeing everything in terms of the definition of roles and tactics....rather than being concerned with teaching.

Taylor: Not so much as the fallaciousness of the way in which it is represented. Something that is more common to historians than we might assume, is that they ask not what history is represented as but what can we learn from it.

Neil: What indeed.

Taylor: We can't leave them with the supposition that Reynolds is as he is in the '98 minutes, without giving thought to the change in Reynolds that takes place organizationally later on.

They secretly feel that if only they could look at more documents, and get more of a cross-section of the documents, they could better spell out the differences. We really believe this, too. If not, then we are victims of historical scepticism of a really destructive kind. We have to believe that we can arrive at some definition of the process of change by looking at the documents.

It's not that we really care what the differences are, but we do care what prompts them to say, "here is the evidence. I think thus..." We do care what intellectual process takes place as they respond to these documents and draw conclusions and ideas about them.

Steve: We ran into problems with this with the Ceresco material, though.

Taylor: What else are we doing? To say that they can arrive at a conclusion with the evidence they have right now is specious. What is it that we want them to simulate at the end of the year, with us, about these documents?

Neil: The status of the material can still be examined.

Taylor: If we burn them with sophisticated reflections on history, with brilliant plays on narrative, we could destroy the credibility of anything.

Neil: We're not aiming at sophmoric despair.

Taylor: Then how much can we ask them to do, innocently and impetuously, without falsifying our own ideas about our own experience? our own approach to history? If we lose sight of our own integrity we end up playing games.

Steve: It's equally dangerous to set up our own methods as models.

Neil: You (Taylor) sound just like Hexter.

Taylor: I think the key to all this is not so much what they do, and not their crudeness (they've been so, coming on cold to these things and sort of being

demanding to perform operations on it), but the quality of intellectual activity when they perform, the intellectual quality of their reflections. I want them to experience over and over again, a kind of reflection in steps, whereby they will be able to become aware of their own experience in relation to the document. They would examine their reactions and conclusions, by going back, after the fact of the conclusion, to the process involved in taking the first step, i.e., notation or something, and to examine their reasons for concluding what they did.

Steve: You could have them do this with anything, then, performing the same one-two step.

Taylor: In the fall we were emphasizing a process of their reaching a language of their own. But we didn't (in the fall) prolong the experience which ought to precede their process of realization. We gave them, so to speak, insufficient foreplay.

We should go on to introduce other documents which refer to the settlement people they've met so far. Each time we get them to where they can move to a conclusion, we have them examine their process in relation to their ideas about the solution of a question. Their experience with the evidence for their statements must be emphasized. It's not their solutions we're interested in, but their awareness of the process which takes place, what they knew and did not know as they began to define some kind of change. If so, we emphasize their examination of how they arrived at a conclusion.

IN CLASS

Could go on to clubs and classes, to annual reports, HW correspondence with the council members, but the idea is to interject a new document... Someone's diary, biographical sketch, notes...

We have to think of a conceptual exercise beyond their response...

Appendix vi

Appended is the paper of Karen Dega, which, I feel, reveals something quite significant and valuable for our plans for next semester. Karen Dega is a rather ordinary student; in fact, she was on probation. She worked extremely hard and did very nice work. The quality of her work appears less a function of dazzling insights than a product of her lack of sophistication. When I asked her what she thought of the course, she was ecstatic, particularly about the chance it gave her to do something she considered completely her own, guided by her own language and her own judgment.

The course gave her a chance to develop by freeing her from having to master either a language or to regurgitate information or poorly understood concepts--things that from her record she would appear not to do very well. Interestingly, she, having no real language for talking of society as did many of the Eastern sophisticates, had much less trouble getting into the material than those whose suppositions took the form of queries about 'the system,' 'the power structure,' 'industrialism,' etc. In general, the freshest work--though not always the best class discussion--came from those who lacked a terminology with which to talk of society. Unencumbered by poorly understood and fuzzy abstractions, they could more easily come to concrete historical insights. Precisely because the course did not provide an over-arching language or the sense that there was 'something' to be digested and given back, these 'average' students, probably for the first time, became actively engaged in their education; and pursued things they themselves had defined with great energy.

1) Certain deductions can be drawn about the people who were members in the Wisconsin Phalanx settlement at Ceresco, concerning their reasons for joining and for leaving, by comparing various aspects of a combination of the membership list and the stock records. These deductions may be substantiated by information drawn from personal manuscripts and newspaper accounts.

2) a. What are the figures which lend themselves to a further understanding of the aims of the people who settled at Ceresco as members of the phalanx?

What are the interpretations of these figures?

What clues do they give as to what the various people wanted?

b. What changes in membership, if any, are indicated by the data?

What is the apparent policy concerning wealth of prospective members?

How does the data compare with figures and statements in the annual reports and the personal accounts and documents?

c. What were the problems faced by stockholders and members?

How might these have been related to the dissolutionment which was instrumental in the breakup?

d. What factors now seem most apparent in the breakup of the phalanx?

3) • sources: stock records
membership list
annual reports
personal accounts
letters
newspaper accounts

I went to the sources listed more out of curiosity than any thought that these specifically would be the documents which would be the documents which would be most pertinent. This is particularly true of my reading of the personal manuscripts. Happily most of the things I read contained aspects related to my general ideas, so that I could tie them together and get a picture of both the personal and the impersonal.

The Ceresco Experiment

In an attempt to discover the reasons for the failure of the communitarian experiment of the Wisconsin Phalanx, I have tried to know more about the people by looking at membership lists and stock records, then drawing deductions from these which can reveal the motivations of those who came. These deductions I have compared with the impersonal annual reports, and the very personal manuscripts of the members themselves.

By compiling a list of the members of the phalanx, and the amount of stock, if any, they held in the association, I have been able to produce some significant figures which may help to understand the motives which prompted the people to come to Ceresco. I set the basis for my figures at 15 or more shares per individual or family, and divided them accordingly:

- 1) young families (father under 40 yrs at time of joining) with 15 or more shares...16/28
- 2) old families with 15 or more shares...12/15
- 3) families of six or more members with 15 or shares...11/14
- 4) families of less than six members with 15 or more shares...17/29
- 5) single persons with 15 or more shares...11/37

The figures concerning the larger and older families show that most of these people had a relatively large amount of stock, and this would seem to indicate that they were looking for economic security when they joined the phalanx. The majority of the people were born in the east, but were lately of Southport, and it is probable that they were attracted to Wisconsin territory by the promise of land available. If this is true, then an undertaking such as the settlement at Ceresco, with its expectations of good land and substantial capital would be a financially safe investment.

Several of the families had older girls in whose names stock was purchased. Since some of these girls were under the 21 voting age, and women could not always vote anyway, the stock may have served as a dowry. Ceresco was the perfect place to come to, in this respect, because the members enjoyed themselves socially to a greater degree than most pioneers could. In one family the eldest daughter was about 27 and had quite a bit of stock, perhaps indicating that her parents were becoming a little anxious about her future, while her sisters, according to their ages, had proportionately less.

Among the young families, which in many cases meant the smaller ones, the percentage of large stockholders drops, though it is still above 50%. This indicates that the phalanx may have been a sort of stepping stone--an easier way of settling unsettled territory than alone as a family group. Many of the families had only very small children and it would have been exceedingly difficult for a one-man family to tame the untamed lands in Wisconsin territory. Many of these families left midway in the life of the phalanx for nearby settlements such as Oshkosh and Green Lake which would support this theory.

Most of the single members were young men and, as the figure shows, not even a third of them had enough money to buy a large amount of stock in the corporation. Therefore one might read their aspirations and purposes as directly opposite from those of the older families. Probably they looked at the settlement at Ceresco as a means of prosperity. According to these records, which I used, many of them married girls at Ceresco, and either bought land there or in Ripon, or moved to settlements only several miles away.

According to Noyes, in History of American Socialisms, Warren Chase wrote in 1846 that

money will not buy admission for those who have no faith in principles, but who merely believe, as most of our neighbors do, that we shall get rich; this is not a ruling principle here.

However, he sounded a little different in June of 1847 when he said, with 170 members at Ceresco,

We have applications for admission constantly before us but seldom admit one. We require larger amounts to be invested now when there is no risk, than we did at first when the risk was great.

This change of attitude by Chase seems to be one of the most important considerations in viewing the decline of the Ceresco community. Probably every personal account expounding on the downfall of the phalanx will mention this as one of the uppermost reasons for failure, blaming it on the directors and Chase. Unfortunately, this theory, in all its relative simplicity, cannot be supported by a comparison of the stock records, membership lists, and annual reports. Chase condemned himself in the above quote by hinting at greater concern for money than association, yet the figures do not reveal this when examined:

families and single persons with 15 or more shares who came in...

1844...19/34

1845...14/33

1846...4/13

1847...0/1

1848...0/4

For the years '47 and '48 I can surmise that there were no worthy, wealthy candidates so none were admitted--but then it is difficult to explain why the four single people and one family were admitted to membership; they had almost no money to invest, yet the man who came in '47 arrived the October following Chase's statement, and had no money to invest. So little stock was taken by the new members of '48 that money could not have been the determining factor.

There were a number of non-member residents living on the phalanx in the later years, and this causes greater confusion. I am not aware of the distinction between non-member-residents (no stock) and member-residents without stock; this is probably a key point, as there obviously was a distinction made.

Membership in the association did not begin to drop off until '47 when it dropped from 180 to 157; by December '48 it had dropped to 120 and still almost no one was admitted. In view of these figures, I would really like to know when it was that all the lazy, money-hungry people came into the association, as was described so indignantly in accounts by the phalanx's true lovers. If the kind of people in the association did change as is reported, then this would have had a great effect on the future life of the phalanx, especially if the change was as pronounced as was stated. What is missing is any hint of when this occurred.

For lack of the necessary information to settle this dispute to my own satisfaction, I elect to speculate.

It seems plausible to me that the people themselves might have changed after living on the phalanx and seeing it grow and prosper yearly. The members gained tremendous knowledge about cultivating the land, building the necessary houses and barns, so that they would be well equipped to start their own farms. As the value of the phalanx property increased, they realized that they had made a good investment, and that they could capitalize on it by selling at a profit (8%). The formation of the new town of Ripon made it that much easier to sell their land, and many of them were able to remain in Ceresco.

As stockholders, the members faced several critical problems which were undoubtedly instrumental in the breakup. One of these large problems concerned the available cash for members. To a great extent the mounting prosperity of the settlement was a paper prosperity. Every year the annual reports record large increases in the value of lands and property, yet what does not come out is the fact that the money earned by the association was being immediately reinvested toward extending the association's wealth, in lands, buildings, or equipment. The people were given small amounts of cash for needed goods during the course of the year, so that they had little money coming to them at year's end. Much of the money earned was put back into stock.

Quite a lot of stock selling went on among residents and members who wanted to leave Ceresco so that stock was being transferred often. People who left before '47 and who were unable to sell their stock to other members, hung on to it instead so that when the stock was finally cashed in 1850 many people who had gone from the phalanx

several years before, still had money to collect. The reason people kept their stock after they left Ceresco was that the corporation lacked the necessary cash to pay for the stock--thus most had to keep it until such time as the phalanx would have money to pay for it. The corporation did this by taking orders on the treasury, similar to bank loans, at 12%:

They could get cash only for necessities. When the society became prosperous enough to allow buying back the stock of residents who were leaving, it became evident that the only way to get one's money back was to leave. This provision was expected to make the people more contented, but in practice it left the remaining members discouraged because the surplus capital was always being used instead of being declared in dividends.

This quote comes from a letter written by Volney C. Mason.

In the same letter that contained the above quote, Volney Mason lists the reasons he feels are responsible for the breakup of the Wisconsin Phalanx:

- 1) discovery of gold in California
- 2) lack of cash
- 3) establishment of town of Ripon
- 4) fonder regard for money than association

From the readings I have done about the members of the phalanx I have discovered one family and one single man who supposedly went gold digging in California. If there were others, and granted the incompleteness of the records there probably were, I cannot imagine the gold rush as having been that instrumental in the breakup. The people who would leave to find gold would have come to the phalanx for the same reasons,

and therefore would have eventually left for greener pastures in some other area. Perhaps the gold rush could even be looked upon as a purifying factor for the phalanx, as it got rid of many of the fortune seekers.

The lack of cash, as I mentioned before was a decided weak point in the structure of the association. In their zeal to build up Ceresco, the decision-makers probably did not think of the fact that it might discourage the people to be unable to make even small purchases for lack of cash; the people were used to handling their own money, and it therefore must have been difficult for them to adjust to the situation of having to request money for incidentals. This would be especially true for families and older people. This is compounded by the fact that the stockholders were not being paid dividends on their stock, that all money was being put back into the corporation. I am not saying that it was wrong of them to have put the dividends back into the corporation--only that I think that the leaders were a little too eager in their endeavors to advance the settlement, so that they lost sight of the need of the people to feel that they had some purchase power.

The last two reasons I feel go hand-in-hand in viewing the Ceresco failures and these reasons are directly related to the lack of cash which I just discussed. Yearly, as I stated before, the people were working and watching the association grow, yet they were not reaping the benefits of the work they had been doing. When cash was finally available in '47, it went to buy back the stock of members who earlier left the phalanx. Probably they began to think of moving from Ceresco and starting off on their own, knowing that

they would make money on the stock they owned when it was cashed in by the association. When the town of Ripon was established, it meant that they could stay in that area even if the phalanx broke down, because now there would be a settlement which would guarantee neighbors, and the conveniences of the phalanx, while at the same time they would be on their own. The records show that a great percentage of the people of Ceresco stayed in Ceresco, which later became part of Ripon, or bought land in Ripon. Many people took land and live stock in trade for the stock they held in the phalanx.

It is easy to summarize on the Wisconsin Phalanx experiment by rather condemning the people who were its members, by saying, as many historians are fond of saying, that the love of association as a new social principle was lost to view, and that the members turned it into a business corporation. But this is unfair and does not account for the flaws in the system as put to work in Ceresco. In making such a judgement, one must consider that "the people" were individuals. Perhaps the founders and lovers of association were too ardent in their love , perhaps the phalanx was put together too much as a machine rather than as a living organism with particular needs which were not always most advantageous to the immediate advancement of communitarianism.

Appendix VII

Log, Tuesday, October 11, 1966

When I came into the room, they were busily noting down each others' version of exercise #3. They were relieved and pleased when I handed them mimeographed copies of the assignment they had only been given verbally. I had promised them that all future assignments would be mimeographed. They were as pleased as I was relieved that I could keep my word.

Struchiner immediately raised his hand: "Mr. Levy, I wonder if you could explain a few of the points Mr. Taylor raised in his lecture. He kind of rambled around and some of it was hard to make out, but it really helped clarify some things. What did he mean by worm into some of the sources and to be conscious of the sources you use?"

Barbara Foreman raised her hand to disagree with Struchiner (who she secretly thinks is much too earnest). "I could follow Mr. Taylor's talk very well because it was rambling. That's the way I think, so it was easy for me to understand it."

Cookie Baker, the young sociologist who I had not seen since our fight two weeks ago over Puritanism and deviants (she had bronchitis and bowled me over with her infected breath when she passed the information along to me). "I agree. I could follow him too because he funbled along, that's just how I think. I understood exactly what he meant."

Young Struchiner, however, persisted with a slight whine. "No, I want Mr. Levy to answer. I want him to explain."

I wrote the word "worm" on the blackboard and labeled it "1" and "sources" was "2". I then made believe that I was Mr. Taylor-Lampard and said, "Why not answer it yourself. What do you think those words mean?" At which point, Barbara Foreman started to answer, followed by sickly Cookie. I really chalked one up for restraint for that! As I fell asleep with a sense of real accomplishment -- so proud of myself that I was not aware of a word they said in answer to the question. All I could observe was their self-generated mouths speaking out their understanding of "worm in" and "consciousness of the sources." Struchiner brought me back to consciousness from my pedagogical fog by insisting, with more of a whine, "No, I want to hear what Mr. Levy has to say. If you don't have anything planned for the class, maybe you could discuss Mr. Taylor's talk a little more."

And I said, faking complete confidence, "Would it be all right if I discussed the lecture and also had something prepared?" I then did a Levy on Taylor which is like Fats Domino playing a Mozart concerto. I told them that by "worm in", Taylor had really meant that they should get inside the material by really almost re-experiencing it in all of its human specificity. That this was a very arduous process and that everyone went about it differently, and since the only thing we as historians could do to make the materials real was to read it and reread it -- there was no definite method as everyone reads differently...that sometimes it took many readings over a period of time to even approach an understanding....that some people underlined the text, made notes, and that big yellow markers had even been invented to blot out the text

Log, Tuesday, October 11

and guarantee that you couldn't see or read it. At this point, Struchiner held up his text (which was full of fat yellow lines).

I told them that since it was such a personal, almost artistic process, that by being conscious of the sources they use, they were being called upon to have an awareness of the process by which they reach the questions they come up with in the material. Cookie Baker interpreted the latter part of this to mean that an historian should be conscious of his own biases. I told her that that was only part of it, that more important, was almost a technical awareness one had to have so you could hear where you hit an off key note. At this point, though I didn't tell the class, I could see a real similarity between the method Taylor is trying to devise for introducing young students to the study and writing of history and the method (ie. THE method that Stanislavsky devised for teaching young actors how to behave truthfully in an imaginary situation -- how to act.)

I told them that very often an actor in preparing his role uses certain specifics to make the imaginary role he would portray on the stage believable to the audience and himself. If his performance has stereotyped moments in it, it is possible for him afterwards to consciously reflect on what went wrong by going over the preparation he used and seeing what in it was faulty. He can do this only because he has a conscious technique which is exactly why YOU should be conscious of the sources you use so that you can see where you are not being true to them and thus coming up with an attitude about them instead of an embodiment of them. Sarah Loyster then jumped up and said, "Well when we find these procedural rules for how to make these details come alive, can we list them and share them?" I said that that's what your log is for and that that would be the next exercise in all probability. She really liked that! So did I! For the first time I knew where I was going and what the next assignment would be and why. They could immediately discern it: 1) because of Taylor's lecture and 2) my amplification of it.

Mark Knipping then asked if he could do his assignment over because it had been wrong and he wanted to get credit for a correct version. I told him he could do it over only if he could learn something from doing it and if he could, he could do it in his log and that I'd be glad to read it if he wanted...but not to worry about it in terms of a grade. I told them that if he had committed himself to a wrong procedure and learned something that that was all that mattered, that in fact, one could really learn much more from taking the wrong route in a committed way than from reading about the correct procedure. At this point, Sarah Loyster started bobbing her head in agreement saying that she had never learned so much as on the last paper when she had been completely wrong. This made me feel good because I had really been hard on her. We next went over the exercise. I told them not to worry too much about outside sources unless they were really necessary. Orlander really got upset because he said there was so

Log, Tuesday, October 11

much outside stuff he wanted to do, that his sister had used the same book in college and told him that there were other books and she had found out from them that Sarah Good was a poor beggar. What a great set up! If there was anything the whole class was aware of from reading the Levin text, it was that Sarah Good didn't have a pot to piss in. All she had was a pipe (to piss in). Good old Russel Orlander. He really saved the day for looking at the text closely! Just like Glaucon in The Republic....I have my fall guy, but I really wish....well, that's silly.

There was really a good feeling after the class. I told them if they had any questions about their other exercises or this one, that I would be in the Union on Wednesday for an hour or so.

*

*

*

The method and history

In preparing a role, the actor must make all the specifics of the character both offstage and on meaningful in terms of action, otherwise he will not be able to act in a believable way.

The historian must make all the details immediate. He must feel their total impress or he will not be able to act, i.e. write history that has any validity, any historical truth.

Just as in acting, the important consideration in making details real is that they must be useable in terms of the action the character must pursue on stage. In other words, the actor in choosing from the details that he has made real through the memory of his senses must do so with his eye on the spine of his part. In other words, the main action of his part becomes the spine around which the real specifics are organized. They feed the spine, the spine gives them a purpose. In writing history, the reality of the details are given focus by the questions the historians asks of the material. You can never write about the total detail but only about what you might get out of it...but you can never get anything out of the detail until you understand and feel it totally. Acting has an action, history has a question, but they are both rooted in human specificity.

APPENDIX VIII

EVALUATION OF HISTORY 290

Betsy Daniels
History 290
Mr. Taylor
January, 1967

The opening assignment served three very useful functions. First, it raised certain problems of assessment. Outstanding of these were: how do you bridge the gap between isolated pieces of specific evidence and generalization, and how does the vantage point of the observer (personal and physical) affect his conclusion. Second, because the essays were personal they aroused an interest among group members in each other which would be continued and provide a helpful base for exchange. The degree of cooperation among class members in this course has been unique (in relation to other university courses) and refreshing. Third, the assignment established the use of our own work as a basis of learning. The usual pressure for grades seems to be removed from this course. I have the feeling that our mistakes are to be used as a basis of correction rather than as an indication of failure.

Getting into the Salem readings at first was slow: I felt a lack of direction in our group meetings and an absence of any central question which might direct my reading. Yet while I did feel this frustration, I also began to develop my own broad question--Why did the witch trials take place?--and an interest in a more specific aspect of it-- whether the witch mania and trials were an outgrowth of the effects of Puritanism. When I came to this I felt that perhaps there was a value in "jumping into the dark" in the sense that it would lead us to ask our own questions. Reading further in Levin such writers as Cotton Mather provided some insight into my questions. Discussions brought out useful hints on what you can find in such a document as trial evidence. I found Mr. Coughlin's lecture on trial procedure very helpful. I think a similar effort should have been made with the phalanx to explain basic economic principles of the 1840's for those of us who are so non-economically oriented

as to have only a vague idea of how a corporation worked. More could be done with developing skill in analyzing technical documents that a historian might have to deal with.

The questions raised earlier dealt with subject, while the value of the study shifted to method. Exercise II provided insights into the use of varied types of documents, how each is distinct, and how they complement each other. After discussing this, some of us volunteered to look into specific areas. I looked at Winthrop's Journal and Sewall's Diary to find the influence of Puritanism on their lives. I found this work very exciting and felt I was getting somewhere with regard to the subject. Yet two problems arose. I could not immediately relate what I had done to the group. Mr. Tallyor's comments in lecture (Oct. 11) were reassuring as they seemed to reinforce what I had done--gone through a very intense reading process which led to thoughts which seemed too simple, too complex, or too unresolved to express. Also a problem of notetaking arose (same problem with microfilms), as I had been so used to underlining and writing copious notes in margins of paperbacks--reacting directly to a line, it was impossible to recopy all the lines and reactions. The assignment of Exercise III virtually forced me to stop the investigation I had begun and this was frustrating. I felt ~~amazed~~ in this work and found it difficult to shift back suddenly to Levin. I think if you are going to allow the "freedom" of individual investigation, it must be given leeway to continue, at least for some time.

As we moved into Exercise III, III-B, and IV, I realized that the emphasis was to be on method and this was perhaps the most valuable part of the course. Exercise III-B was particularly exciting. The points to be learned from this, some of which were brought out in Mr. Lampard's lecture (Oct. 18) were valuable and most meaning-

ful because we learned from our own papers. Going through the process of writing and encountering difficulties ourselves made the problems more clear and understandable than a second-hand observation. Discussion at this time became more lively, drew more active interest, and was made more comfortable by shifting to first names. Exercise IV also proved very interesting in our discussion of what it means to "write history." I was disappointed that we did not discuss these papers, though general discussion of Starkey was interesting. I think it might be useful to analyze our final papers on the Wisconsin Phalanx as we did Starkey.

The last discussion on Starkey I thought was particularly good. Mr. Taylor's suggestion that a possible solution to questions we had been raising about historical writing might be a combination of III-A and III-B provided an ingenious summary and insight into what we've been establishing, based on our own work. The best thing about the section was the degree to which the interest level reached the same plain among group members. We were excited by Mr. Taylor's sharing with us a thought process he had undergone the night before (concerning a passage in Starkey) and everyone jumped in. We had a focus which interested Mr. Taylor and everyone in the group. One of the biggest problems in the second part of the course was a complete lack of such a situation. Various people were interested in various things at various times. Many discussions fell flat and there was a noticeable decline in interest at times.

The approach to Ceresco shifted from emphasis on historical writing to historical investigation. We began with a more definite framework (Mr. Ham's presentation) than Salem, but encountered more problems later. The microfilm materials I felt did not give us a wider scope, but served as a kind of anthology. We felt that this was all the information available on Ceresco and did not seek outside

sources as much as we had with Salem. The slowness with which the microfilms were ready was a major hindrance to progress. I think the the last couple of weeks, with hypothesis framed and questions opened up, were good, but this point should have been reached earlier. I can suggest a few things I feel went wrong in tracing the following.

The assignment of various documents to different group members was a good start, but its subsequent usefulness was prohibited by the initial unavailability of many films, and the switch of tact later. Another unfortunate mistake we made was not emphasizing or reporting about the section we held without Mr. Taylor (Nov.10). Certain very definite questions were raised about Southport, capitalism and radicalism in the 1840's and the phalanx which were ignored the next time when we discussed Fourierism. From then until the decision to concentrate on the long house, discussions vacillated. A problem arose at this point which continued until the session just prior to vacation. The place of the group became obscured. The consciousness we had kept up with Salem was not evident with Ceresco. Except for occasional conversations outside of class, people had very little idea of what other people were doing. (In some cases, people were doing nothing.) Any excitement I felt during these weeks was over independent work--I could not relate to the group sessions and the only interaction I felt was outside of class. I'm not sure why the out-of-class exchanges did not enter into class discussion, but they didn't.

Exercise V was valuable mostly in terms of seeing what people had been reading. Also the idea of asking answerable questions was helpful. I found many of the questions my paper raised could be answered and found ways to answer them I might not have otherwise have thought of.

Setting the focal questions of why people went to Ceresco

and why it dissolved (Nov.29) gave needed direction to the class.

At this point my reading became most meaningful both for myself and as it related to the class. The decision at the next meeting to concentrate on the long house, I believe, was a mistake. Certain problems became apparent to me at that time. The decision to concentrate on the long house seemed to reflect a frustration about the lag in recent discussions which had been fluctuating between Fourierism in general and Ceresco in particular. The problem in letting people dig on their own is that it hinders discussion. Individuals feel lags and spurts in their own work, but the group loses its function. I think the chief problem was that we were trying to do two things at once--(1) let people explore individual concerns and (2) center a group discussion. In trying to do both we accomplished neither. Assignments were vague and changing. If they had been more specific we could have gone off totally on them, realizing that it would be several weeks before any fruitful synthesis could be achieved or any lively discussion could take place. In this case we would have been confined to individual reports and conferences for a while. I think there is a certain value in the individual aspect of learning. For me, it arouses the problem of getting "a feel" for things and then trying to show someone else what it is I've accomplished.

The decision to concentrate on the long house seemed to be an attempt to focus discussion and in that sense might have been good. But the timing was wrong because we had reached a point where success might be forthcoming and the concentration on the long house forced our discussion back to detail. There is often a danger of getting so rapped up in detail that you lose sight of the larger concerns. By this time I had begun to believe that people came to Ceresco largely for economic reasons and wanted to follow up this hypothesis. Further research, supposedly for the long house, only

reinforced this hypothesis. Yet I did not bring this out in class because I felt we were supposed to be talking about the long house and my thoughts were not relevant to that. The discussions that were best for me were those that deviated from the specifics of the long house. I think the material connected with the long house would inevitably have been brought out as a supporting example to larger questions posed. Discontent was to a small extent expressed outside of class, but never in class until the session before vacation when we were asked for evaluative opinions. It was at this point that some consensus was reached and new questions opened up.

I think this point should and could have been reached earlier. If a study of this sort should be meaningful in terms of larger questions, it certainly leads into many. I myself find the relationship between the "Utopian movement" and "Jacksonian Democracy" a question of interest. Our knowledge of Ceresco could also lead to comparative studies with other "Utopian" communities and/or "regular" towns in Wisconsin or the west in general. I definitely feel that a thorough study of the "microcosm" is the best way to begin to understand the larger picture. There might be some value at this point in dividing the group into individual projects revolving around a central issue. For example, each person could study a different town in the same general area.

The chief problem in the Ceresco unit was that we lost consciousness of what we were doing. I think a fairly definite decision should be made as to what your objective is. By this I do not mean subject-matter but method. If you want to base a learning experience on individual research, give it some leeway. If you want to learn to analyze a certain type of document, do it in a group session. I think the most important thing to be learned from this course is methodology. The second is an entrance into a period thought a thorough understanding of a specific occurrence of development.

APPENDIX IX

DRAFT COPY OF EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR

HISTORY 290

Often the objectives spelled out for courses call for students to gain insights, appreciations, understandings, content, skills, knowledge, knowings, and learnings. These are often unmeasurable directly but have to be inferred. As a student you may be in a position to judge whether or not you have an understanding of the period under study, can appreciate the character of the times, grasp causes within this historical period, have a better appreciation for the historian's task, have gained skill in the historian's task, and have obtained content. What have you gained? The following questions are intended to disclose how you think about this class. Please raise additional questions if you have concerns that the questionnaire does not explore.

1. List the purposes of this course.
2. Describe two of these purposes.
3. Describe the reading of books and documents for this course with the following questions in mind: (Substantiate your judgment)
 - a. Which documents and books seemed helpful?
 - b. Which did not seem useful?
 - c. Which were most interesting?
 - 1) Were these directly related to the objectives set for you?
 - 2) Were these of minor relevance for the objectives?
 - d. Which seemed like a "waste of time"?
 - e. Did you discover additional material that you felt to be of great value?
 - f. If you have other questions that you feel should be raised about the material for reading, please specify them.
4. Describe the class discussions in this course with the following questions in mind: (Substantiate your judgment)
 - a. Which discussions seemed helpful?
 - b. Which discussions did not seem useful?
 - c. Which were most interesting?
 - 1) Were these directly related to the objectives set for you?
 - 2) Were these of minor relevance for the objectives?
 - d. Which seemed like a "waste of time"?
 - e. If you have other questions about the discussions that you feel should be raised, please specify them.
5. Describe the writing for this course with the following questions in mind: (Substantiate your judgment)
 - a. Which writings seemed helpful?
 - b. Which writings did not seem helpful?
 - c. Which were most interesting?
 - 1) Were these directly related to the objectives set for you?
 - 2) Were these of minor relevance for the objectives?
 - d. Which seemed like a "waste of time"?
 - e. If you have any other questions about the writings, please specify them.
6. Did you feel that the required writings were excessive?
 - a. If so, was this "personal", in that writing is for many a difficult skill?
 - b. If so, was this in the nature of the writing which you were asked to do? For example: not especially relevant... continued long after the point had been made...etc.

7. How does this method of historical study differ from the methods of historical study more commonly employed in history classes?
(Discuss these questions in relation to acquiring information, gaining and understanding of an historical period, grasping the problems of pin-pointing causative factors in historical situations.)
 - a. What advantages does this method have?
 - b. What disadvantages do you feel this method offers you as a student of history?
 - 1) Raise any other issues or questions in this category that seem significant to you.
 - 2) What sort of questions in relations to what sort of objectives would your instructors probably wish to stress in this category?
8. Specify how the course process and content concurred with your expectations or how it did not concur.
9. What do you feel you have failed to gain in doing history this way, if anything?
10. Did there seem to be teacher biases which forced you to accept or ignore things you otherwise felt essential to what you were doing in the course. If so, was there opportunity for honest discussion of the differences you felt?
11. Was there opportunity for you to initiate discussions, course directions, or assignments? Was this necessary or would it have been appropriate within the context of this course?
12. Did you feel free to discuss the issues under study?
13. Were evaluational procedures used by the instructional staff consistent with what you felt to be the objectives of the course?
14. Did the objectives of the course become clear to you as the course progressed?
15. Did a few people dominate the discussions? If so, were they always the same people?
16. If you had difficulty in entering or initiating a discussion, was there any effort made to help you increase your skill at doing so?
17. Specify what could have been done to make the course more meaningful to you.
18. Were there times when you felt lost in the course? Were these times resolved by your being "found"?